

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Noah Jarvis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Emeline S. Connor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Henry W. Riden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill correcting the record of John C. Partlow—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill to correct the military record of Henry Bischoff—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill to correct the military record of James M. Schofield—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE (by request): Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Travis Glascoe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina: Petition of Annie M. Wilbur and Mary Louisa Latimer, to accompany House bill for compensation for the use of certain lots in Greenville, S. C., by United States troops—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: Petition of Pork Packers and Provision Dealers' Association of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against discrimination of freight charges upon shippers of less than carload lots—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Hudson Pharmacy, H. L. Stiles, and other druggists of Philadelphia, Pa., to modify the existing internal-revenue law—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, January 17, 1900.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on motion of Mr. HOAR, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal, without objection, will stand approved.

REPORT ON REINDEER IN ALASKA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 4th instant, the report of Dr. Sheldon Jackson upon "The introduction of domestic reindeer into the district of Alaska in 1899," together with its accompanying maps and illustrations.

This information is communicated in response to a resolution offered by the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER].

Mr. TELLER. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Printing. I suppose it ought to go there, although it is often printed without such a reference.

The motion was agreed to.

LAWS RELATING TO COURTS-MARTIAL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a copy of a bill to prevent the failure of military justice, and for other purposes, prepared by the Judge-Advocate-General of the Army, and stating that it meets with his approval; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

FRENCH SPOILIATION CLAIM.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting conclusions of fact and of law filed under the act of January 2, 1885, in the French spoliation claims, set out in the annexed findings of the court, relative to the brig *Lady Wallerstorff*, John Gutterson, master; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. TURNER. I present a petition of the legislature of Washington, relative to the Northern Pacific Railway lands, declaring some to be forfeited, etc. I ask that the petition be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House memorial No. 4. State of Washington. Sixth regular session. To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States:

Your memorialists, the legislature of the State of Washington, respectfully represent that a large number of citizens of Clark and Cowlitz counties, in the State of Washington, are actual settlers and home builders upon certain

odd-numbered sections of public land within the forfeited limits of the grant to the "Northern Pacific Railroad Company," opposite to and coterminous with the line of said road not constructed between Wallula, Wash., and Portland, Oreg.

That said settlers established their homes on said lands after the time expired within which, under the grant, said road was to have been completed and after it had become apparent said line would not be built down the Columbia River between said points by said company, and fully expecting to derive title to said lands from the Government of the United States under the homestead laws.

That said settlers number about 600 and are mostly heads of families, and, although poor and without capital, they have, by hard labor and self-denial, made extensive and valuable improvements on said lands, consisting largely in clearing off timber, stumps, logs, and brush, at great labor and expense of time, amounting in many instances to \$100 per acre, and in building dwellings and other structures thereon as homes for themselves and families.

That the grant to said company from "Wallula to Portland" was made July 2, 1884. That an additional and new grant was made to said company May 31, 1870, on its line from Portland to Tacoma, which line was definitely located September 22, 1882, but was not constructed until the year 1884.

That the technical limits of these two grants overlapped northeast of Portland into both Clark and Cowlitz counties. That a general withdrawal of lands was made under said grants by the Interior Department on August 13, 1870, and maintained regardless of the Congressional act of forfeiture of September 29, 1890, until the 18th day of July, 1895, when in a decision known as the Spaulding case (21 Land Decisions, page 57), the Secretary of the Interior held, in conformity with a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States (152 U. S., 234), that no lands included in the prior grant of July 2, 1884, were or could be granted in the subsequent grant of May 31, 1870, and that all said lands, pursuant to said forfeiture act, were therefore public lands and subject to entry under the laws of the United States.

That homestead entries were thereafter allowed on said lands in all cases, except where the railroad company had obtained patents thereto.

That patents were procured by said company for a large part of said lands in May, 1895, notwithstanding the then pending homestead applications of said settlers and the fact that the Spaulding decision above referred to was then being formulated.

That subsequently the Secretary of the Interior determined that these patents were wrongfully issued and requested the Attorney-General to bring suits for their cancellation.

That said settlers were threatened by the railroad company with eviction from their homes on said lands, and, before the Spaulding decision, many of them were driven against their protest into making contracts with the company for the purchase of their homes, in which they had invested years of toil, but to defend which they had no money or other resources to carry on litigation with a powerful corporation.

That common justice and humanity calls for legislative relief.

That attempts of this kind have been made, but so far they have been ineffectual.

That the act of Congress of March 3, 1896, extending the time for bringing suits to cancel patents has resulted in nothing for the benefit of said settlers, but has, on the contrary, apparently confirmed the company's title and to an extent aided the company in enforcing said contracts.

That the act of Congress of July 1, 1898, gives the company the right to select other lands in lieu of all lands it desires to relinquish in these limits, but does not require it to relinquish any lands it has sold or contracted to sell. That said last-mentioned act does not appear applicable to the lands of said settlers situated in forfeited limits, and, if it did, would be fatally injurious to hundreds of their number who have been compelled to contract with the railroad company under the erroneous rulings of the Land Department prior to the Spaulding decision and by the threats of the company to eject them from their homes. That the practical effect of said act is to confuse and embarrass the rights of said settlers and ought to be amended.

Your memorialists therefore ask, in behalf of said settlers, that said act of Congress of July 1, 1898, be amended by eliminating from the second proviso thereof the provision that the company shall not be bound to relinquish lands sold or contracted by it, and that an act be passed declaring that the forfeiture act of September 29, 1890, applies to and includes the lands within the limits of the grant to the Northern Pacific Railroad Company opposite to and coterminous with the line of said road not constructed between Wallula, Wash., and Portland, Oreg., within which limits, extending to or near the Willamette meridian, are situated the lands of said settlers, and directing the immediate institution of suits by the Attorney-General of the United States for the cancellation of the patents to said lands wrongfully issued as aforesaid to said railroad company. And we request our Senators and Representatives in Congress to do all in their power to that end, and hereby direct that copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State.

Passed the house January 17, 1899.

Passed the senate February 8, 1899.

CERTIFICATE.

STATE OF WASHINGTON, OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE,
Olympia, Wash., December 2, 1899.

I, Will D. Jenkins, secretary of state of the State of Washington and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the enrolled document now on file in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the State of Washington the day and year above written.

[SEAL.]

WILL D. JENKINS,
Secretary of State.

Mr. TURNER. I present a memorial of the legislature of Washington, remonstrating against the cession of territory in Alaska. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate memorial No. 5. State of Washington. Sixth regular session. To the President of the United States:

Your memorialists, the legislature of the State of Washington, would respectfully represent that in 1825 the Governments of Russia and Great Britain, by clear and formal treaty, determined the intervening line between their respective possessions on the continent of North America. Great Britain then acknowledged the right of Russia to all of the Pacific coast north of 54° 40' and Portland Canal and west of the summits of the range of mountains nearest to the coast. If such mountains were far from the shore, then the

line was to be drawn 10 marine leagues from the ocean. During the following forty-two years Russia remained in undisputed ownership of all that region known then as Russian America, and until in 1867 her title thereto was passed to the United States for \$7,000,000.

At that time the white inhabitants numbered about 1,000, all of whom, save a few engaged in the fur trade, were reliant upon the Russian Government for their means of living. There were no fisheries, no manufactures, no mining, no farming, no business or relations with any other country and people than Russia and the Russians.

With the advent of the Americans came a change. Steamers began to run there from California, Oregon, and Washington ports; people of the world were invited to take advantage of the opportunities on every hand; military and naval protection was given against the savages of the land; mail services were established and Government explorations undertaken; the fur-seal fishery employed scores of vessels and hundreds of men and became worth millions of dollars; salmon were found off the coast, and great fisheries were established, employing hundreds of men, who put up now 25,000,000 to 40,000,000 1-pound cans of fish each summer for the Australian, European, and American markets; quartz was found; mines were opened and mills built, one of them, with 880 stamps, being the largest in the world; placers were also found, and from the two sources upward of \$5,000,000 of gold were obtained during the year 1898.

Two hundred and fifty American steamers were engaged in the Alaska trade last year, and an average of more than one vessel a day departed from Seattle alone for ports in that Territory. Sawmills have been started there, some farming done, a halibut fishery begun, and in the summer a great number of tourists go to those interesting shores.

All this development of resources has involved the opening of the country, the civilizing of the natives, and the establishment there of a large population of American citizens, with two cities of at least 3,000 inhabitants each, and many smaller towns. In these cities are daily newspapers, electric lights, telephones, street cars, and a railroad to the interior. In the whole Territory are over 30,000 citizens of our country, an average gain since 1867 of 1,000 per annum.

With its practically untouched timber, its coal, petroleum, codfish, whale, fur-bearing animals, etc., added to its seal, salmon, gold, and other resources as attractions, there is reason to believe that Alaska, with its half million square miles of territory, will support comfortably a half million people a half century hence. It is no Greenland, but rather a Sweden and Norway, and like those countries will be a great factor in the commerce of the world.

While Russia held the country Great Britain apparently cared nothing for it. Beyond a fur-trading privilege no attempt was made to avail of it. Taken during the Crimean war, it was cheerfully relinquished at the close as of no value.

Not until the citizens of the United States showed its worth in fish, in timber, in gold, and in trade did the Britons and Canadians evince interest in and desire for it. Then by insidious methods attempts began to fix a claim upon the country. The old maps were discarded, and new maps issued, upon which the boundary line began further north and was located nearer the sea, taking into the Dominion a considerable area of the best portion of southeastern Alaska.

The next step was to get the newspapers to publish the claim and to fix it in the public mind as a proper and regular thing contemplated even by the treaty makers of 1825. From this it was easy to cause a contention, first local, and then international, in consequence of which their claim could be placed before the British-American joint high commission, where nothing could be lost, but where something might be gained in the making of concessions and exchanges common to such bodies. It was a clever scheme, but one without honesty, justice, or merit.

In accordance with this plan, it is now proposed to cede to the Canadians a portion of Alaska. It is said that the ceded portion will include the head of Lynn Canal, made world-famous during the past two years by the rash of 50,000 gold miners to the Klondike. It will wholly include the town of Dyea, with its inhabitants, its aerial tramway, and its United States military garrison; and it will also include one-half the city of Skagway, with 4,000 more inhabitants, its 20 miles of American-built railway, its four large wharves, its trade, and growing importance.

Again, it is reported that the ceded portion is to be other than that above described, and is to include the head of Pyramid Harbor, from which [it] takes inland the route to the Yukon, known as the Dalton trail, established by and heretofore solely used by Americans.

The cession of either of these places or of any other Alaskan port will transfer from the United States to a foreign power the sole and absolute control of intercourse with the great interior, in which is involved a traffic of enormous proportions and of great wealth. Such cession will injure every citizen of the United States from San Diego to Sitka, and will humiliate the country from ocean to ocean and end to end. For the first time in our history our flag will be hauled down and the land over which it has long floated will be given away, sold, or surrendered; this, too, without considering the wishes, wants, or rights of the people most affected, and this, too, for either no consideration or for a consideration of trifling character. That such an act can be perpetrated in these days of national glory, of patriotism, and expansion is incredible. Against its commission the protests of the people should prevail, and that of the State of Washington is here and now earnestly and respectfully presented.

Your memorialists respectfully ask that after consideration of this, their memorial, by the President, is to be transmitted to the joint high commission for the adjustment of Canadian questions.

And your memorialists will ever pray.

Passed the senate February 11, 1899.

Passed the house February 11, 1899.

Approved February 16, 1899.

CERTIFICATE.

STATE OF WASHINGTON, OFFICE OF SECRETARY OF STATE,
Olympia, Wash., December 2, 1899.

I, Will D. Jenkins, secretary of state of the State of Washington and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the enrolled document now on file in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of the State of Washington the day and year above written.

[SEAL.]

WILL D. JENKINS,
Secretary of State.

Mr. TURNER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Spokane, Wash., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Skamania County, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for a change in the forest reserve boundary; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. SIMON presented a petition of the Oregon Viavi Company, of Portland, Oreg., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ALDRICH presented a petition of the Woman Suffrage Association of Rhode Island, praying that the word "male" be not inserted in the suffrage clause of the constitution of Hawaii, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines, and praying for the adoption of a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the disfranchisement of United States citizens on account of sex; which was referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

He also presented the petitions of J. Sanford Davis and 10 other railway mail clerks of Pawtucket, Charles B. Butler and 2 other railway mail clerks of Westerly, and of Christopher H. Carpenter and 45 other railway mail clerks of Providence, all in the State of Rhode Island, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. THURSTON presented a petition of the Woman Suffrage Association of Nebraska, praying for the omission of the word "male" from the suffrage clause of the constitution providing for the annexation of Hawaii, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines, and for the adoption of a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution prohibiting disfranchisement on account of sex; which was referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented the petition of Henry L. Loomis, of Union Mills, Ind., and the petition of Theo. E. Otto and sundry other citizens of Columbus, Ind., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Claims, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1243) for the relief of the owner or owners of the schooner *Bergen*;

A bill (S. 879) for the relief of Levi Stoltz;

A bill (S. 1934) for the relief of the Globe Works, of Boston, Mass.;

A bill (S. 189) for the relief of the owners of the British ship *Foscobia* and cargo;

A bill (S. 32) for the relief of George W. Weston; and

A bill (S. 1744) for the relief of the Atlantic Works, of Boston, Mass.

Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 795) for the relief of The William Cramp & Sons Ship and Engine Building Company, of Philadelphia, Pa., reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PETTIGREW, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 103) for the relief of John O'Keane, of the State of Washington, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. VEST, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2258) to authorize the Union Railroad Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Monongahela River, reported it without amendment.

Mr. QUARLES, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1771) granting a pension to Ellie Kee, reported it with amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

EGBERT C. SAMMIS.

Mr. TALIAFERRO, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3) for the relief of Egbert C. Sammis, administrator of the estate of John S. Sammis, deceased, late of Duval County, Fla., reported the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 3) entitled "A bill for the relief of Egbert C. Sammis, administrator of the estate of John S. Sammis," now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims, in pursuance of the provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States," approved March 3, 1887. And the said court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of such act, and report to the Senate in accordance therewith.

DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

Mr. PLATT of New York. I am directed by the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the concurrent resolution submitted by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] December 14, 1899, to report it with amendments; and I ask for its present consideration.

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

The amendments of the Committee on Printing were, in line 2, to strike out "fifteen thousand" and insert "seven thousand five hundred;" in line 7 to strike out "five thousand" and insert

"twenty-five hundred," and in line 8 to strike out "ten thousand" and insert "five thousand," so as to make the concurrent resolution read:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there be printed 7,500 additional copies of Senate Document No. 164, third session Fifty-fifth Congress, being the report of the Daughters of the American Revolution, 1890-1897, of which 2,500 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 5,000 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

The amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution as amended was agreed to.

DAUGHTERS OF ARTHUR BARNES, DECEASED.

Mr. JONES of Nevada, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by Mr. BUTLER on the 10th instant, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay to May Barnes, Blanche Barnes, and Maud Bynum, daughters of Arthur Barnes, deceased, late a messenger on the rolls of the Senate, a sum equal to six months' salary at the rate paid by law to said messenger, said sum to be considered as including funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ASSISTANT CLERK TO COMMITTEE.

Mr. JONES of Nevada, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by Mr. LODGE on the 9th instant, reported it without amendment; and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Philippines be, and it is hereby, authorized to employ an assistant clerk, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$1,800 per annum until otherwise provided by law.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 2488) granting a pension to John Eckland; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2489) to provide for the further distribution of the reports of the Supreme Court; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ALLEN introduced a bill (S. 2490) granting a pension to Margaret A. Miner; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BATE introduced a bill (S. 2491) for the relief of George H. Morton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McBRIDE introduced a bill (S. 2492) granting an increase of pension to C. Cunningham; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 2493) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for land in certain cases; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce two very extended bills having relation to the Post-Office Department. One of them has reference to the civil administration of the Department and the other is a codification of the criminal laws pertaining to offenses against the postal service, with, I think, some amendments. The bills are introduced (and I make this brief explanation because the chairman of the Judiciary Committee is here) in two separate measures with the idea of referring so much of the subject as affects the criminal statutes to the Committee on the Judiciary, and to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads so much as affects the civil administration of the Department, with the hope that after the Judiciary Committee has, as it will, carefully considered the measure, then it may be reported to the Senate and the two bills be consolidated into one measure.

There has been no attempt ever to codify the laws of the Post-Office Department, and for nearly thirty years the different laws affecting its administration and offenses against it have been scattered through hundreds of pages of our statute books. The Attorney-General for the Post-Office Department has, with the commission assisting him, at great pains prepared a summary and codification of all the laws with the idea that perhaps at this session of Congress we may be able to whip them into shape and get them in the form of one chapter of our statutes. This is especially important from the fact that there is from all over the country a demand for the codification of the postal rules and regulations, which are found necessarily very difficult of acquirement by postmasters and others.

Therefore, in introducing these bills, one of which is for reference to the Post-Office Committee and the other to the Judiciary Committee, I venture to call the attention of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee to them.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator from Colorado is doubtless aware, as the Senate is doubtless well aware, that two years ago there was passed a bill, and it became a law, for the codification of all the

criminal and penal statutes of the United States. The commission was appointed by President McKinley, and their work, I suppose, is nearly completed. At any rate, the additional duty was imposed upon them of codifying the statutes in regard to the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States, and that portion of the work is complete and it has been reported to the Senate. I think the measure about to be introduced by the Senator from Colorado will be a great aid to the Senate. I think it will be necessary, however, to compare it with the work of the commission.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. HOAR. And then I think the idea suggested by the Senator, instead of having the whole work of the commission taken up at once, to have this substituted for that portion, is a very convenient way of proceeding.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am obliged to the Senator. I know they will dovetail together.

The bill (S. 2494) to revise and codify the laws relating to the Post-Office Department and the postal service, and to amend the same, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

The bill (S. 2495) to revise and codify the laws relating to offenses against the postal service, and to amend the same, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WOLCOTT introduced a bill (S. 2496) granting certain lands to the town of Manitou, Colo.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. ALDRICH introduced a bill (S. 2497) granting an increase of pension to Sarah W. Rowell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BUTLER introduced a bill (S. 2498) for the relief of John F. Foard; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. BUTLER. To accompany the bill I present a petition signed by a number of citizens of North Carolina, requesting that the bill for the relief of Dr. John F. Foard be passed, and a number of papers establishing this claim. I move that the petition and papers be referred with the bill to the Committee on Claims. The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER introduced a bill (S. 2499) to authorize needed repairs of the graveled or macadamized road from the city of Newbern, N. C., to the national cemetery near said city; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. TILLMAN introduced a bill (S. 2500) for the repeal of section 4716 of the Revised Statutes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2501) granting increase of pension to soldiers of the Mexican war; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. THURSTON introduced a bill (S. 2502) for the establishment of a general depot of the Quartermaster's Department of the United States Army, at Omaha, Nebr.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WELLINGTON introduced a bill (S. 2503) for the relief of Deford & Co., of Baltimore, Md.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FAIRBANKS introduced a bill (S. 2504) for the relief of Holy Cross College; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2505) granting an increase of pension to James C. Carlton; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SPOONER introduced a bill (S. 2506) granting an increase of pension to Michael Dillon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO CLAIMS BILL.

Mr. TURNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1676) for the payment of certain claims; which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TURLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1676) for the payment of certain claims; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

MITCHELL F. JAMAR.

On motion of Mr. CAFFERY it was

Ordered, That the Committee on Claims be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1668) for the relief of Mitchell F. Jamar, and that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

JUDGMENTS IN INDIAN DEPREDAATION CLAIMS.

Mr. CULBERSON submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Attorney-General be, and he is hereby, directed to report to the Senate all judgments for Indian depredations that have been rendered by the Court of Claims that are not included in his last report.

IMPROVEMENT OF NAVIGATION IN NORTH CAROLINA.

Mr. BUTLER submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to have a survey made and to submit a report of the survey and an estimate for the improvement of navigation of the Livingston Creek, in Columbus County, N. C., and Lockwood Folly River, in Brunswick County, N. C.

THE RAMIE INDUSTRY.

Mr. ELKINS submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That Senate Document No. 47, and Senate Document No. 57, Fifty-fourth Congress, second session, be reprinted for the use of the Senate, together with certain additional matter pertaining to the ramie industry, to be revised by Mr. Slaughter, with information for the farmers' uses.

Then, that the Public Printer be authorized to present Mr. S. H. Slaughter with the stereotype and plates of his ramie documents, Nos. 47 and 57, Fifty-fourth Congress, second session, and the articles published on the ramie industry by the Government in the May and September, 1897, numbers of the American Republics Bulletin, to be used in his work for the promotion of the ramie industry, free of charge to him.

INQUIRIES RELATIVE TO THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. By agreement certain resolutions were permitted to lie on the table, and those resolutions are now in order.

Mr. BERRY. There is a bill which I am informed is especially important—

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator allow this resolution, which is in order, to pass? I believe it will be passed now without debate and without being read.

Mr. BERRY. Certainly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution submitted by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] on the 8th instant. It has been read in full.

Mr. VEST. I should like to hear the amendment read.

Mr. HOAR. The amendment has been agreed to by myself and my colleague, and it has been read. Does the Senator desire to have it read once more?

Mr. VEST. I was not in the Senate when that amendment was read, and I simply want to understand what it is.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the amendment which was accepted as a part of the resolution by the senior Senator from Massachusetts.

The SECRETARY. After line 7 in the original resolution the following amendment was inserted:

Also, all instructions given by him to the commissioners to the Philippine Islands, or either of them;

Also, any information which may have come to him or any Department of the Government since January 1, 1898, in regard to any plans of the people in arms against the United States for the pillage of Manila, for risings in the city, or for the destruction of foreign property and the massacre of foreign residents;

Also, any information that may have come to him or any Department of the Government of the treatment of the other inhabitants of the Philippines by those in arms against the authority of the United States, and of the attitude and feeling of such other inhabitants or tribes toward the so-called government of Aguinaldo and his armed followers;

Also, any information that may have come to him or any Department of the Government of the treatment of prisoners, either Spanish or American, by the people in arms against the authority of the United States;

Also, any information that may have come to him or any Department of the Government as to any aid or encouragement received by Aguinaldo and his followers from persons in the United States, as to what pamphlets, speeches, or other documents emanating from the United States, and adverse to its authority and to its policy, were circulated, in whole or in part, among the Filipinos in arms against the United States, among the other inhabitants of the islands, or among the soldiers of the United States, and any information as to the effect, if any, of such pamphlets, speeches, and other documents, or of similar utterances in the United States, upon the course of the rebellion against the United States;

Also, any further or other information which would tend to throw light upon the conduct and events of the insurrection against the authority of the United States in the Philippine Islands, and of the military movements for its suppression since January 1, 1898.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, I wish briefly to address the Senate on this subject.

The resolution is in the discretion of the President. Such information as he chooses to send us we are to receive under this resolution. I am in favor of passing the resolution. I am desirous of securing whatever information we can upon this subject.

Early in the session, nearly a month ago, I introduced a resolution asking whether the vessels of our Navy, the officers of our Navy, had saluted the flag of the Philippine republic; whether two of our vessels accompanied a Filipino vessel to Subig Bay for the purpose of capturing a Spanish garrison, and whether after the surrender of that garrison we turned the prisoners over to Aguinaldo's forces. That resolution was tabled by the Senate without allowing me the privilege of speaking upon it. The facts contained in that resolution, in my opinion, were true. We made Aguinaldo and his forces our ally by saluting their flag and by accompanying them in the capture of a Spanish garrison, the prisoners of which we turned over to them.

I introduced the resolution in good faith. I was not sure then, but I feel sure now, that the facts contained in the resolution were true, and I wanted the record evidence. Information has come to my knowledge since—the statement of an officer who accompanied this expedition to Subig Bay—corroborating the facts contained in the resolution, and thus is disclosed the reason why the information was denied. The resolution was in the proper form; it was a proper question.

The storm of indignation on the part of the American people and many of the Republican newspapers throughout the country at the suppression of this resolution led to a change of tactics, and then I introduced the second resolution, asking if the insurgents, after fighting had commenced, did not send General Torres with a flag of truce and ask that fighting be stopped, and that a neutral zone should be agreed upon, the boundaries of which were to be established by General Otis and satisfactory to him, until negotiations could be had to see whether the difficulties could be settled, and I also asked in that resolution what reply was made and whether General Otis did not reply that fighting having once commenced, it must go on to the grim end.

That resolution was not laid upon the table at the time, but an amendment or a substitute was offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] asking for all the information and all the dispatches which may have passed between our officers and the insurgents, as they are called. But on yesterday my second resolution calling for these facts was laid upon the table. I conceived these facts to be pertinent. If we had recognized Aguinaldo's forces and Aguinaldo's government by saluting their flag, and had acted with them and made them our allies, then we are now fighting our allies.

If we began the war, as General Otis indicates in his report, by killing the first man and then acting on the aggressive while the enemy acted upon the defensive, it seems to me the proof is conclusive that the war was commenced by us, and if, after two days' fighting, the insurgents wanted to stop the war, to stop the killing, and we said it must go on to the grim end, then I assert, Mr. President, that the blood of every soldier who has fallen since that time is on the head of this Administration and there is no escape from it; the puerile and silly talk about those who oppose the policy of the Administration being guilty of the death of our brave men disappears absolutely, and the responsibility goes where it belongs; the sixty boys from South Dakota who lost their lives, conscripted into an unwilling service, retained after their term had expired, lies at the doors of the Administration, and there is no chance to avoid it.

This information has been withheld. My resolution to acquire it has been laid upon the table. I hope the resolution which we are now to pass will bring the information. It is pertinent to the issue.

But, Mr. President, I offered another resolution yesterday—a resolution calling for all the instructions to our commissioners at Paris and the correspondence between the Administration and the commissioners at Paris; but that was laid upon the table, and then the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] charged me with trying to put the Administration in a hole.

Mr. President, it seems to me, in the light of the facts which have been developed in this contest to secure information, that the only thing that can put the Administration in a hole is the truth and that it is the purpose to keep the truth from the American people in order to keep from putting the Administration in a hole. If getting the truth before the people of the United States will embarrass the Administration, I can not help it, and I shall try to get it. I charge that this censorship of the press, this concealment of facts, was for the purpose of protecting the interests of the Administration for reelection, and now I am charged, because I tried to get the facts by a proper resolution, with trying to put the Administration in a hole.

Now, let us see. It is asserted by the imperialists that this situation was brought upon us by an act of God; that these islands are in our hands by the act of Providence. The President alludes to this fact in his message, and in speeches he has stated that God has placed a duty upon us, or similar language. Many of those who advocate this policy, not of expansion but of imperialism—the government of colonies against their will and by conquest—declare that we are doing God's service.

Now, Mr. President, if this information which is asked for by this last resolution discloses the fact that the President of the United States immediately upon the signing of the protocol which led finally to the treaty of peace instructed our commissioners to take nothing less than the island of Luzon, and if afterwards he instructed them to take the whole group, the only way I can see that God's hand is in this work is that He must have made Mr. McKinley His prophet. He must have appeared in a vision to the President. Of course, if this is true, the disclosure of these instructions and this information would put the Administration in a hole.

What are the facts which led up to the treaty with Spain? I find in the report of the Secretary of the Navy for 1898, on page 122, volume 2, the following telegram:

WASHINGTON, August 13, 1898.

DEWEY (care American consul), Hongkong:

The President desires to receive from you any important information you may have of the Philippines; the desirability of these islands; the character of their population; coal and other mineral deposits; their harbor and commercial advantages, and in a naval and commercial sense which would be the most advantageous. If you have other information which may be of value to the Government in their negotiations, the President may desire your presence here. If he should request you to come, take the quickest route of travel.

ALLEN.

Here, then, is a telegram the day Manila fell and the day after the protocol was signed, sent by Mr. Allen, the First Assistant Secretary of the Navy, to Mr. Dewey to know which island or whether all the islands were worth grabbing or not. Dewey answered as follows:

MANILA, August 20, 1898.

SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, Washington:

Referring to the Department's telegram of August 13, important islands are: Colon, Luzon, Panay, Cebu, Negros, Leyte. Others, owing to the nature of the inhabitants, have a small amount of civilization, want of cultivation. They may be neglected, especially isles of southern group.

The isles of the southern group are where the Sultan of Sulu reigned, where they have polygamy and slavery. Dewey said, "They may be neglected, especially the isles of the southern group."

Luzon is in all respects the most desirable to retain. Contains most important commercial ports. Manila is farthest north. Produces all of the good tobacco. Friendly natives. Civilization somewhat advanced. Not yet developed. Possible rich minerals. Population, 825,000. Subic Bay best harbor for coaling purposes and military. Water deep; landlocked; easily defended. Strategically, command of bay and city of Manila, with arsenal at Cavite, most valuable.

Panay, Cebu, Negros thickly populated, most civilized, and well cultivated. Iloilo second commercial port; center of sugar trade; a good harbor strategically; in view of the situation, good for defense. Cebu third commercial port; a good harbor, very desirable. No coal of good quality can be procured in Philippine Islands. Some has been mined on Cebu, English company. I trust it may not be necessary to order me to Washington. Should regret very much to leave here while matters remain in present critical condition.

DEWEY.

Now, Mr. President, it appears that immediately upon signing the protocol the President attempted to ascertain the value of these islands, whether they had coal and mineral, etc.—their resources. Was it an inspiration that led the President to make this inquiry? Certainly if God had anything to do with this transaction the inspiration must have come to the person who had the power and did direct that we should take nothing less than the island of Luzon.

Afterwards we took all the group, polygamy and everything else. Who directed that? Was that God's work also? Who insisted that our flag should fly above a harem and a slave market? Why, Mr. President, it seems to me that if a man did a philanthropic act, if he did something prompted by the better nature of man, it would be well to charge it to the Supreme Being. But if a man is going to plunder somebody else and wants to know whether what he has is worth stealing or not, the inspiration ought to come from the devil and not from God.

But, Mr. President, this extreme philanthropic view of the subject, this extreme responsibility thrown upon the Deity, is not shared in by all men. They are divided on the subject. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] is extremely intense in this direction, and also in the direction of taking the islands, because they are rich and will be so profitable to have, while the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT] objects to the sordid view of the Senator from Indiana and does not want quite so much philanthropy mixed up with the transaction.

Now, what I want to ascertain is what the argument is on the part of the imperialists. Are we going to rely on the doctrine that we are going to bless those people with our civilization against their will, and that God has ordered us to do a great work? That is the English doctrine, the doctrine which has justified the plunder of every colony she has conquered on earth. Are we going to do that, or are we going, after all, to fall back on half of the position of the Senator from Indiana and the whole position of the Washington Post on this subject, and are we simply going to say, "They are rich and worth seizing, and therefore we will seize them, no matter how much blood and treasure it costs"? If the contest is to settle down to this proposition, then perhaps the information asked by my amendment which was tabled yesterday, for the instructions to the commissioners, is immaterial.

If we are going to settle down to the proposition that here is a foothold from which we can join the other robber nations of the world in plundering China, and the foothold itself is worth having, then I am prepared to show, Mr. President, that the islands are not worth having; that they will confer no happiness upon the people of the United States; that they will simply increase the burden of the men who produce the wealth of this country, for we raise our taxes by a per capita levy upon consumption.

It will simply lay a burden upon the people who raise the reve-

nue and pay the taxes, and compel them not only to furnish the money, but to furnish the common soldiers, to be officered by the wealthy classes, who own and control the Administration. Our boys will look forward to a career to end in unknown graves in a tropical land. A high aspiration, is it not, for the descendants of men who established, as they believed, a perpetual and eternal republic in this country?

No revenue can come from these islands to the United States. We have spent more money already than every dollar of the commerce, if their commerce is no greater than it has been in the past, that those islands will have for the next fifteen or twenty years. Their total commerce, their imports and their exports, were not to exceed \$15,000,000 a year. We have spent \$200,000,000 already, besides the \$20,000,000 we gave Spain.

Did Spain insist on our taking the Sulu Islands, with its slavery and polygamy, when we offered her \$20,000,000 for these islands? The correspondence would show. We are in the dark on that subject.

If she did, with what irony, with what concealed satisfaction, she must look upon the act! I imagine the Spanish people enjoying great satisfaction at the wonderful victory which they have gained over us by the overthrow of every principle we ever advocated and the adoption of the Spanish policy. Did Spain force upon us this Sulu group? I should like to have known that fact. But if, after all, this debate is simply to be that this is a profitable venture and the elements of philanthropy are to be discarded and abandoned, if cant and hypocrisy are no longer to be the chief reason given, before this debate is over we shall show that a constant loss and drain must come to the people of the United States if we undertake to hold the group.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as modified.

The resolution as modified was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate—

Mr. HOAR. I ask leave to make one statement, which I did not wish to make before, I was so anxious to have the resolution adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator desire a reconsideration of the vote by which the resolution was adopted?

Mr. HOAR. I will move to reconsider the vote in form, and I make it now. I merely wish to say that there are one or two phrases in the amendment of my colleague which do not commend themselves to my judgment as fitting phrases, but I did not wish to make any point on them or to delay the resolution by discussing them. I do not want them quoted against me hereafter as expressing my belief of the present condition of things; that is all. I withdraw the motion to reconsider.

SEIZURES IN AND NEAR DELAGOA BAY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution submitted by the senior Senator from Maine, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. HALE on the 10th instant, as follows:

Whereas property of citizens of the United States not contraband of war has been lately seized by the military authorities of Great Britain in and near Delagoa Bay, South Africa, without good reason for the same and contrary to the accepted principles of international law; and

Whereas said property is now unjustly detained by the military authorities of Great Britain, in disregard of the rights of the owners of the same: Therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the Secretary of State is hereby requested to send to the Senate all information in possession of the State Department relating to said seizure and detention; and also to inform the Senate what steps have been taken in requesting the restoration of property taken and detained as aforesaid, and whether or not the Department has informed the proper British authorities that, if said detention is persisted in, such act will be considered as without warrant and offensive to the Government and people of the United States.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I do not suppose that there is any objection to the resolution; but, at the suggestion of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], I wish to amend the second whereas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has the right to modify the resolution.

Mr. HALE. The second whereas reads:

Whereas said property is now unjustly detained, etc.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I have not the resolution before me, but I suggest to the Senator from Maine that as I recollect it it alleges as a matter of fact and law, of course, that the property was improperly and unjustly seized. That is just the question at issue. I do not think we ought to be concluded on that point. I suggest the same amendment with regard to the first whereas.

Mr. HALE. Let the second be amended first so as to read:

Whereas it is alleged said property is now unjustly detained, etc.

The SECRETARY. After the word "whereas" insert the words "it is alleged."

Mr. WOLCOTT. I should like to have the resolution read.

Mr. HALE. As soon as we get it modified it will be read, of course. The first whereas reads:

Whereas property of the citizens of the United States not contraband of war has been lately seized by the military authorities of Great Britain—

There is no question about that—

in and near Delagoa Bay, South Africa.

I think that is all right.

Mr. DAVIS. How does it read now?

Mr. HALE. Now let the resolution as amended be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution as modified will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution as modified, as follows:

Whereas property of citizens of the United States not contraband of war has been lately seized by the military authorities of Great Britain in and near Delagoa Bay, South Africa, without good reason for the same, and contrary to the accepted principles of international law; and

Whereas it is alleged said property is now unjustly detained by the military authorities of Great Britain, in disregard of the rights of the owners of the same: Therefore,

Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the Secretary of State is hereby requested to send to the Senate all information in possession of the State Department relating to said seizure and detention, and also to inform the Senate what steps have been taken in requesting the restoration of property taken and detained as aforesaid, and whether or not the Department has informed the proper British authorities that if said detention is persisted in such act will be considered as without warrant and offensive to the Government and people of the United States.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I wish to be heard for a few moments on the motives which impel me to make that motion.

It is my present impression that this resolution or any resolutions on this subject are prematurely introduced. The event to which this resolution relates is not a month old; it is in course of diplomatic consideration. Nothing has appeared yet to indicate that the negotiations are not proceeding in the most satisfactory manner. But, Mr. President, irrespective of that, I think it is gravely to be considered whether the absolute assertion in the first "whereas" of this resolution is correct or may not be incorrect as a principle of law under all the circumstances as now understood. It is asserted in the first line of the first "whereas" of this resolution that—

Whereas property of citizens of the United States not contraband of war has been lately seized—

That is well understood to relate to American flour seized upon British vessels; and here the declaration is that this flour under any circumstances, or under the circumstances involved in that case, not fully understood as yet, not yet reported upon, is absolutely not contraband of war.

Mr. President, in regard to that, the principle, as I understand it, is that flour or any product of that character may or may not be contraband under the particular circumstances of the case. As a general rule, the products, like flour, of a neutral country are not contraband; but it is a question of fact whether the immediate destination of such flour is for hostile purposes, namely, the sustenance of a belligerent army. That is a question of fact. If it is so immediately destined it is contraband of war.

The first recital proceeds still further:

without good reason for the same, and contrary to the accepted principles of international law.

That is a declaration by the Senate deciding the very question in dispute, the question concerning which the two Governments are now negotiating—whether in this particular case, this special situation, that seizure has been a departure from or contrary to the principles of international law. My impression, as at present advised, is that it will not be wise for the Senate to make an explicit statement of that kind when such a matter is under negotiation, and when, after all, the determination of a clear question of fact must be made before the question of law can possibly arise.

This event is not a month old; it is being negotiated about. No information has been given that the negotiations are not progressing satisfactorily. Let us wait and see before we pass resolutions of this character, authoritatively determining as an absolute principle of law that which we do not know and can not know is applicable to the yet unascertained facts of this particular case.

But, Mr. President, what strikes me as the thing most to be criticised in this resolution—and I do not want to vote upon it under present conditions without more consideration being given to it—is the concluding paragraph, which reads:

And whether or not the Department has informed the proper British authorities that if said detention is persisted in such act will be considered as without warrant and offensive to the Government and people of the United States.

I venture to say that no declaration of that kind was ever given out by a government, either through its executive organs or its legislative bodies, until negotiations had failed and as an immediate preliminary warning that the situation had become so irremediable by negotiation as to probably require the invocation of hostile acts.

To require the Secretary of State or the President, in regard to any negotiation which is all around understood to be progressing satisfactorily so far and not yet concluded, to inform another Government in limine that unless the very thing which the two Governments are contesting about diplomatically is yielded at once refusal shall be "considered as without warrant and offensive to the Government and people of the United States" is very serious and offensive language. It means, in substance, in effect, and by all usage, it is nothing but a threat of resort to the last reason of kings.

I think, Mr. President, the resolution would best be referred. The Senate ought not, at the present amicable stage of the controversy, to decide as an absolute principle of law the very question that is under negotiation; it ought not, above all things, to make the declaration with which this resolution concludes.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, the circumstances that gave rise to this resolution are found in the statement which I ask may be read from the Secretary's desk touching the seizure of American property.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

Mr. DAVIS. May I ask the Senator what it is he desires to have read?

Mr. HALE. It is an extract from a report in one of the daily New York papers at the time of the transaction.

Mr. DAVIS. What is the date?

Mr. HALE. I do not remember. It was at the time of the seizure, perhaps the next day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The date of the dispatch is December 26, the Chair is informed. The Secretary will proceed with the reading.

The Secretary read as follows:

TWENTY THOUSAND BARRELS OF FLOUR ABOARD.

Three steamships sailing from New York for South African ports, including Lourenzo Marquez, in Delagoa Bay, in Portuguese territory, have been held up by the British within three months. The Dutch steamship *Maria*, which sailed from this port on August 30, arrived at Cape Town on October 4, at East London on November 6, and at Delagoa Bay on November 12; the British steamer *Beatrice* sailed from New York on October 17 for Algoa Bay, East London, and Delagoa Bay, and the British steamer *Mashona* left New York on November 3 for Algoa Bay and Port Natal.

Each of these vessels carried American flour consigned to Portuguese merchants at Lourenzo Marquez. The total amount was about 20,000 barrels. Norton & Son, of the Produce Exchange Annex, are the agents for all three of these ships.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I drew the resolution with some care, intending to limit it in its effects to an inquiry. The Senate is entitled to know what the situation is; the country is entitled to know what the situation is. It does not know, and there is to-day profound ignorance as to what is going on in asserting the rights of the United States which have been infringed by the military authorities of Great Britain.

The statements of fact in the resolution are borne out by the situation that this property of citizens of the United States—not arms, not explosives, not munitions of war, but flour—proceeding to a foreign port, belonging to American citizens, has been seized and that this property is not contraband of war. No lawyer can doubt it. We do not need the investigation of a committee to determine that.

It is no light event. Property of our citizens transported in the line of peaceful trade, seized by one of the armed powers in a war that is going on, is a thing which profoundly affects the American people; it affects every corn grower, every wheat farmer, the owner of the cattle on a thousand hills, the mill man, the middleman—everybody who is interested in producing and exporting the products of the farm and the field is interested in this question and is entitled to know what has been done in this case.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, says that we shall not know and that the Department shall not be asked until his committee has taken the resolution and passed upon it, as it would upon a statute or upon a treaty; and many Senators believe if it goes to that committee, that will be the end of it. The majority of the Senate, Mr. President, can send the resolution to the committee—can stifle the resolution—but it can go there in no other way. A yea-and-nay vote of the Senate can declare that this Senate is not enough interested in the subject-matter to send this inquiry to the Secretary of State.

I might have made the resolution very much stronger. The Senator from Minnesota objects to the following language:

And whether or not the Department has informed the proper British authorities that if said detention is persisted in such act will be considered as without warrant and offensive to the Government and people of the United States.

I might have put into the resolution a motion to the Secretary of State that it is the sense of the Senate that he should so state to the British foreign office, but I have done nothing of that kind. I have simply asked the Secretary of State to report to us whether he has done that or not. In his reply, if he says that he has not, that ends it. I do not know, Mr. President, but what personally I should have been willing to have put in the stronger

language of suggesting to or directing the Secretary of State to go as far as this, but I did not think in the scope of a resolution of inquiry I ought to do that. The Secretary of State is not instructed in any way in the matter. The resolution reads:

Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the Secretary of State is hereby requested—

That should be, of course, "directed." Such resolutions are always put in that way; and I will modify the resolution by making that change now.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. What is that?

Mr. HALE. I modify the resolution by putting in the word "directed" instead of "requested," because that is the form the Senate always uses in resolutions touching the Departments.

That the Secretary of State is hereby directed to send to the Senate all information in the possession of the State Department relating to said seizure and detention—

Can anybody object to that?

and also to inform the Senate what steps have been taken in requesting the restoration of property taken and detained as aforesaid.

Not demanding—

Mr. HAWLEY. Why not stop right there?

Mr. CHANDLER. I suggest to the Senator to stop at that point; to strike out the remainder of the paragraph after the words "detained as aforesaid."

Mr. HALE. Certainly. I do not consider that the resolution is giving any instruction to the Department. I am entirely willing the resolution shall stop with the words "detained as aforesaid," and I will modify it in that way.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Is the Senator sure that the flour which has been taken is the property of American citizens? It has been stated again and again in the press that this flour was taken from an English ship, and was sent from here by a commission house which claims and asserts without dispute that its responsibility ceased when it sent its bill of lading to its English correspondents; that the whole controversy is between English subjects and the English Crown; that the flour was taken upon an English vessel, and that no American is making the slightest claim whatever for any damages by reason of the seizure of the flour. I ask the Senator if he has any information about that?

Mr. HALE. That is precisely what I am trying to find out. If the State Department has found that the facts are as indicated by the Senator from Colorado, it will send us that information at once, and we ought to have it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. But that is not what the Senator says in his resolution. The Senator says, "Whereas property of citizens of the United States not contraband of war has been lately seized." If such property has not been so seized, we are a little premature.

Mr. HALE. But it is necessary to make certain statements as the foundation of a resolution. I have no question whatever that this property—I do not say that I know it, but I have no question—that it was the property of citizens of the United States, and it was so alleged in the newspapers at the time of the seizure.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The New York World, or whatever paper it was, published that; but I understand the American consignors disavow any responsibility, and it is a question whether title did not pass upon the bill of lading being furnished to the English correspondents. I merely want the facts.

Mr. STEWART. Will the Senator from Maine allow me to make a suggestion?

Mr. HALE. Yes.

Mr. STEWART. I suggest that the Senator modify the first clause so as to read, "Whereas it is alleged;" then strike out all of the preamble after the word "Africa," and then strike out all of the resolution after the word "aforesaid," in line 6. I think with these changes the resolution would be passed by unanimous consent. It would then read:

Whereas it is alleged that property of citizens of the United States not contraband of war has been lately seized by the military authorities of Great Britain in or near Delagoa Bay, South Africa; Therefore,
Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of State is hereby directed, etc.

Then let the language of the resolution stand as it now does down to the word "aforesaid," in line 6, and there stop.

Mr. HALE. That amendment has already been made.

Mr. STEWART. The last part has been amended, but not the first, I think.

Mr. DAVIS. Not in the first part.

Mr. COCKRELL. The first clause of the preamble has not been changed.

Mr. HALE. That was suggested by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], and I agreed to it.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. What I wanted—I do not know whether or not it has been done—was, after the word "whereas," to insert "it is alleged that."

Mr. HALE. I agreed to that.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. So that the first "whereas" should read:

Whereas it is alleged that property of citizens of the United States, etc.

Mr. DAVIS. How about the second "whereas?"

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. That has been amended.

Mr. HALE. Yes; and I agreed to the other amendment, too.

Mr. DAVIS. Has the last clause of the resolution been stricken out?

Mr. HALE. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS. Then I have no objection to it.

Mr. HOAR. I should like at some time to put a question to the Senator from Maine, if I can get the opportunity.

Mr. STEWART. I wish to suggest that—

Mr. HALE. Let us have the changes in the resolution stated.

Mr. GALLINGER. Let the resolution be read as it has been modified.

Mr. STEWART. My suggestion was to strike out all after the words "South Africa," in the first "whereas," and that the amendment suggested by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] be inserted. Then I am sure there will be no objection to the resolution.

Mr. HALE. The amendment suggested by the Senator from Connecticut was, after the first word "whereas," to insert "it is alleged." I agreed to that, and the same words can be inserted after the word "whereas" in the second clause of the preamble.

Mr. STEWART. My suggestion is to strike out all after the words "South Africa."

Mr. HALE. You can not do that, because putting in the word "alleged" covers all that follows. It now reads that "it is alleged" that such and such has been done. That covers everything.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Let the first "whereas" be read as it now stands.

Mr. LODGE. I hope that will be done.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read as requested.

Mr. FORAKER. Let the whole resolution be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the entire resolution as it has been modified.

The Secretary read as follows:

Whereas it is alleged that property of citizens of the United States not contraband of war has been lately seized by the military authorities of Great Britain in and near Delagoa Bay, South Africa, without good reason for the same, and contrary to the accepted principles of international law; and

Whereas it is alleged that said property is now unjustly detained by the military authorities of Great Britain, in disregard of the rights of the owners of the same: Therefore,

Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the Secretary of State is hereby directed to send to the Senate all information in possession of the State Department relating to said seizure and detention, and also to inform the Senate what steps have been taken in requesting the restoration of property taken and detained as aforesaid.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Maine a question, if I may be permitted—

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. Does the Senator understand that it is in accordance either with the usage of the Senate or with the proper conduct of our foreign relations to address such a direction as this to the Secretary of State? Do not such resolutions always go to the President, and do they not always reserve the President's discretion as to the interests of the public service?

It may be that an apparently harmless statement by the Senate, which is a part of the diplomatic authority of the Government, may, by reason of some misunderstanding, seriously and injuriously affect pending negotiations. A minister of the United States was removed on the alleged ground that he had stated on his own authority to a foreign Government that if they took a certain position, of course they would take it under their responsibility for the consequences. That was all. It was a position which the United States was combating and which the Administration, if necessary, would combat by force; but such a communication made it very difficult for the other party to yield.

I suppose, in deference to other Senators who are charged with the foreign relations of the country more particularly in the first instance, that the uniform course of the Senate in regard to matters affecting our foreign relations and under diplomatic discussion is to address a request to the President; that we should not intrude upon such a diplomacy by a peremptory direction to the Secretary of State to make public the negotiations in a pending case or other information of more or less importance. I have understood that that has been the custom of the Senate.

I wish to ask the Senator from Maine, Would it not be better to address this resolution to the President, with the usual reservation that he shall communicate the information if not incompatible with the interests of the public service, instead of going to the Secretary of State with this direction?

Mr. HALE. I thought of that in drawing the resolution, but I find that there are plenty of precedents, where information is sought simply as to current events, for directing the Secretary of

State, like any other member of the Cabinet, to convey information to the Senate; and under those conditions I prefer that the resolution, which has now the formal matters connected with it adjusted and made satisfactory, I believe, to everybody, shall remain in its present form.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have no objection to the resolution in its present modified form, as I understand it, but I want to ask the Senator from Maine if I understood him to say that food products could not be contraband of war?

Mr. HALE. I do not know, Mr. President, that I should say that under any circumstances and conditions food products may not be contraband of war, but it would take a very extreme condition to make contraband of war flour, corn, meat, things which are purely articles of commerce, not, as I have said, munitions of war nor arms nor explosives. I do not know but that such a case may be found where flour had been purchased for an army and was being transported directly to that army. It may be that under those conditions food products might be contraband. But I must remind the Senator that if any American Administration should go so far as to yield that point, it would be fraught with the greatest danger to us, not now but in any future war.

During the whole time when the empire, now the Republic, of France was overrun by the German armies, when war was going on in French territory and when France was raising armies in order to meet the Germans and to drive them off, if possible, we kept exporting flour, corn, and all sorts of breadstuffs and meat into French ports without Germany questioning it. I have no doubt that at that time such was the need of the French armies that if a cargo of flour was unloaded at Marseilles the French Government at once purchased, or, perhaps, before that time had purchased, it for their army, and yet Germany never thought of invoking this doctrine of "contraband of war" applying to food stuffs. While my answer to the Senator is that there might possibly be a case—an extreme case—where the powers of the world would agree that flour might be contraband, I can hardly imagine it, and I do not imagine that the State Department to-day is yielding that principle and is doing anything that in the future will get us into trouble in wars that may be waged by the European powers. I do not intimate that, but I do want the information, and as the resolution has been modified I hope it will pass.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I asked the question because, if my memory serves me correctly, we took very strong ground in regard to that subject at the time of the civil war, and I think we carried the doctrine a good deal further than Lord Stowell carried it when we made serious objections prior to the war of 1812, and I think the doctrine of "continuous voyage" has never been carried so far as we have carried it in the *Springbok* case and in some others.

Mr. HALE. The Senator will bear in mind that if we took, as he has stated, strong ground in this direction in the war of the rebellion, it was because we had established a blockade. That introduced a new feature, undoubtedly.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator can not remember the cases to which I refer. These were cases where articles held to be contraband of war were taken to Nassau and Matamoras, to neutral ports, and our courts held that that only constituted a stage in the voyage; and as to the fact that they were sent to neutral ports, I think the language used was that it was simply one plank in the same wharf.

Mr. HALE. Undoubtedly. It was on the way to break the blockade.

Mr. LODGE. Precisely; but that was a question of fact and a matter of proof. If it could be shown that those products were for the use of the enemy in arms, we held the doctrine that they became contraband of war.

Now, I did not rise for the purpose of discussing the validity of that doctrine, but the fact that we send flour to the Boers to-day or that we send flour to England to-day, as we are doing every day—we have an undoubted right to do it—does not affect the question of its being contraband of war, supposing either belligerent party think they can prove that it is to be used for a military purpose; that is, if we adhere to our own decisions. It seems to me that it opens up a somewhat delicate and doubtful case in view of the attitude on which we ourselves have insisted with great elaboration.

As I said, I have no objection to the resolution as it stands. I do think—I agree with my colleague entirely—that it ought to be addressed, as all of these diplomatic inquiries are addressed, to the President of the United States, because it is through him that we receive all our diplomatic information. It seems to me that it ought to be put in the usual form, to the President of the United States, if not inconsistent with the public interest, and I hope that modification may be made.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, the preamble and the resolution have been very considerably modified by putting in the words "it is alleged" in the two branches of the preamble, and by striking out the concluding phrase in the resolution styling the conduct of Great Britain, in a certain contingency, as "without

warrant and offensive to the Government and people of the United States." But I do not like it now. If we are beginning a serious discussion with Great Britain, which may have serious results, we should do it in that dignified and courteous style which befits a great nation in the face of possible serious eventualities. This is not a diplomatic paper, as it stands now, and it was worse before, of course, because it conveyed a veiled threat of war, and that is not the way to meet an argument with European powers, especially Great Britain.

Now, I have no doubt that that Government will be disposed to do anything within reason to maintain friendly relations with us. There now exists between these two countries that courtesy which, as the poet says, "befits nations ancient foes, turned friends."

I wish to make a suggestion to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. In view of the relations that the committee holds to the President and Secretary of State, it would not be difficult, in a private, informal conference, to find out the condition of this affair, and whether it would be agreeable to the Administration to disclose the present situation of the negotiations. And that brings me to another criticism.

Most unquestionably this inquiry ought to be directed to the President of the United States, with the usual caveat, because as it stands now the President of the United States might be very well aware of certain facts, certain language, etc., which it would not be wise to give to the public, but he can not exercise that discretion under the resolution as it reads now. It "directs" the Secretary of State to send to the Senate certain information. The President can not command the Secretary of State under this to omit certain parts of the correspondence. I think it is quite wrong, and I think the better way is to put the resolution in the hands of the Committee on Foreign Relations, that it may study the true situation and advise us as to what is the wisest thing for us to say.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY] is laboring under a false impression as to the power of the Executive in this matter. I understand that the Secretary of State, like every other member of the Cabinet, is subordinate to the President of the United States. Of course there are thousands of things done in the Departments about which the President knows nothing, but they are supposed to be done by his authority. A very important matter of any kind coming before a Cabinet officer—I mean involving a question that might get us into trouble with a foreign power and things of that kind—would naturally go to the President. The Cabinet officer would go there with it and consult the President. The President has the authority to say to any Cabinet officer, "You decline to answer that if you think it ought not to be answered."

I wish to suggest to the Senator another thing. The words we put in—to inform us, if he does not think it incompatible with the public interest—are words simply of courtesy and nothing else, and the resolution goes to the President with exactly the same force, and no more, with the words out than it would with the words in. We could not compel the President of the United States to send us information that he believed it contrary to the public interest to send. There is no way in which we can do that. Yet, of course, if we found that he was withholding that which we thought ought to be sent here, we could impeach him, and we could impeach him just as well with those words out of the resolution as with the words in. We should keep in mind all the time that we direct these officers simply because it is supposed to be a little more in accord with our dignity to say to a Cabinet officer, "You do this," and we request the President when we address him personally because it is more dignified and proper with reference to his high office that we should request of him.

There is no difficulty about this matter. If the Secretary of State thinks there is any trouble about it, he will consult the President, and if the President thinks there is any impropriety in the request, we will find it out by a declaration from the Secretary of State that it is considered incompatible with the public interest to give the information.

I want to say one word now about the contraband question—not that I am going into any discussion of it. Food may be contraband of war under certain conditions, as the Senator from Maine says. Those conditions are pretty well understood. Our relations with the commerce of the world during the war of the rebellion were very different from those of most nations, because there were two things we were asserting: First, that this was our country, and while certain governments had recognized the belligerency of these people, we insisted all the time that their relations existing with us were different from those which would exist if it were a foreign war; and we maintained a blockade on the coast, which we had to do after the declaration that these people were entitled to belligerent rights.

Now, I do not understand that when we ship to Europe food of any kind it is contraband of war because somebody in Europe may ship it to a country engaged in war; and the Senator from Massachusetts will have to hunt a good deal to find that we have

laid down any such international law as that. We can not afford to do that. Mr. President, there will not be any difficulty about this matter. If Great Britain has seized our flour which was on its way to a neutral port, although she may think it is going into a hostile region to feed some people, she is not going to hold it. If there are any people in the world who are interested in maintaining the principle that food is not contraband of war it is Great Britain. She is not going to say, for the purpose of this affair down there, which is a small affair, that food is contraband on the high seas. If food is contraband so are mules, and Great Britain is buying mules in this country and shipping them directly to Africa for use in the army; and if anybody should complain of our shipping flour we may complain of their shipping mules also.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BACON. It is for a question.

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. I desire to inquire of the Senator from Colorado whether he understands the language "and contrary to the accepted principles of international law" to be an announcement on the part of the Senate that we consider it a breach of international law, or does that come in under the general phrase "it is alleged?"

Mr. HALE. That is right; that is it.

Mr. TELLER. I suppose it would come under the general phrase "it is alleged." There are conditions where food is contraband of war. For instance, where a fort is besieged the rule is that you can not introduce it into that fort. That is contraband of war.

Mr. WOLCOTT. You can not introduce what?

Mr. TELLER. Food.

Mr. BACON. The question I desire to ask the Senator is this: If that is the construction which it is intended by the author of the resolution shall be put, simply that it is alleged to be contrary to the accepted principles of international law—

Mr. TELLER. Certainly; it is alleged to be contrary, and if the Department shows us a condition of affairs which makes it contraband that is the end of it.

Mr. BACON. I do not understand, in other words, that this resolution announces as a proposition adjudicated by the Senate that it is contraband of war.

Mr. TELLER. No; I do not think so.

Mr. HALE. I should have put in those words in drawing the resolution if I had thought of them. The moment the Senator from Connecticut yesterday or the other day suggested them, I agreed that they ought to go in; and they cover all that follows.

Mr. TELLER. I think so.

Mr. President, this question of contraband articles of war has been somewhat modified and enlarged of late years. There has been a disposition to hold that coal is contraband of war, as well as other things. But I do not myself have any uneasiness about what will happen. I am satisfied, from what I see in the public press, that the Government has taken steps in this matter. The newspapers tell us that our Government has submitted the whole matter to the British Government, and they have agreed to reply when they become familiar with the facts. The newspapers tell us that they have already returned the flour to the parties who claimed it. Whether that is true or not we do not know. We will know when we get the answer to this resolution.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President, the resolution as it has now been modified seems to be unobjectionable in form, but the question whether it is wise to adopt the resolution at this time still remains, and the more I think of it the more I think it is unwise for the Senate, while a contention of this kind is pending between the Executive Departments and the representatives of the British Government, for the Senate to interfere, not that we do not have the right to do so, although I think we ought to address our resolution to the President of the United States, with the usual qualification, that if he does not think it incompatible with the interest of the public service he shall communicate the information to the Senate.

The Secretary of State does not stand exactly in the same relation to the legislative department that the other Secretaries of Departments do. The Secretary of State is not required by law to report to Congress. All other Cabinet officers, if I am not mistaken, are required by law to report to Congress. The Secretary of State has been exempted from that requirement for the very reason that his duties are mainly diplomatic, carried on with foreign countries and upon matters which may be very delicate and which may involve us in serious embarrassments if the negotiations during their pendency are reported to Congress.

Mr. President, is there anything in this case which makes it necessary that the Senate shall depart from its usual custom and call upon the Secretary of State to report the exact conditions of the negotiations which are pending between our diplomatic officers and the diplomatic officers of Great Britain? I think not. I think, on the contrary, from all that we hear, that the negotiations are

being conducted with propriety and with earnestness and in a way which is likely to lead to a satisfactory conclusion. Under all these circumstances, I think it is unwise to pass the resolution. If there was any disposition apparent in any way on the part of the Secretary of State, representing the President, not to deal energetically with this matter, that might be a reason why we should ask that all the information in his possession should be communicated to the Senate.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. I presume, of course, that the Senator from Connecticut is aware that the newspapers contain reports, more or less largely circulated, that there is an agreement or understanding between the United States and Great Britain, and it is at least suspected by some Americans that that is true. There is, furthermore, an idea that this Administration is more friendly to Great Britain than it is to the Boers, and with that view I presume the Senator from Maine desired to have the direct information as to whether those newspaper insinuations had any foundation in fact. We can get that in no other way so clearly and so positively as by letting the diplomatic officers of this Government tell us just what they have done, so as to find out whether the rights of American commerce have been invaded, and whether the American Administration is taking the necessary steps to see that the right of search, for which the war of 1812 was fought, is not being set up here at this late day, or that we are submitting to even greater indignities than we did then.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. It is quite a long inquiry, Mr. President.

Mr. TILLMAN. I did not make it as an inquiry, but as throwing some light on the course of the Senator's remarks.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I would very much prefer that the Senator from South Carolina should illuminate my remarks after they are entirely completed. But if, as the Senator from South Carolina intimates, the motive for the introduction of the resolution is founded upon a suspicion that our Government will not assert its rights as against the English Government, then it is an additional reason why I do not wish to vote for this resolution. I have no such suspicion. I believe that the President and Secretary of State will vigorously and rigorously insist upon the rights of the citizens of this country. I am rather glad to be illuminated by the Senator from South Carolina as to the motive which underlies, as he supposes, the introduction of this resolution, which is that there is a suspicion that our Government will not deal earnestly and vigorously in upholding the rights of commerce of American citizens.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator allow me again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERKINS in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. I presume the Senator has seen in the papers that we are shipping mules to the British army for purposes purely military, and that our markets are open to Great Britain because she has a fleet and can get her supplies across the ocean without any interruption, whereas Delagoa Bay is in Portuguese territory and is the only outlet or port of the Boers. It does seem to me that every American is interested in having equality of trade and equality of opportunity on the part of the Boers to get munitions of war, whether flour or what not, in the same way that England is getting them here in the open market without any protest or effort on the part of this Government or anybody else to restrain them. And England should not be permitted to interfere with our commerce to a neutral port.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. If I understand international law, there is no inhibition upon any American citizen selling and shipping supplies of any sort to governments or to individuals representing governments who are engaged in war. They do it at their own risk. If the goods are seized in transitu, then the question arises whether they are contraband of war. This is a question which our Government considers.

But I am not to be diverted from the point I was making, that I do not believe it wise, just at this stage of the negotiations, to call upon the Secretary of State or the President to tell us exactly what representations he has made and exactly what replies he is getting from the representatives of the English Government in the discussion which is going on between the two Governments.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will my colleague pardon me an interruption? He says "call or request." He will note that this is a demand and a command.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Exact'y. I have said all that I desire to say.

Mr. HALE obtained the floor.

Mr. FORAKER. Will the Senator from Maine allow me for just a moment?

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. FORAKER. I wish to inquire of the Senator from Maine if he has objection to further amending his resolution so as to address the inquiry to the President instead of the Secretary of State? I think there are a good many Senators here who would have no objection at all to the resolution in that form who do object to it in its present form. I myself would prefer to vote for the resolution, if I vote for it at all, in the amended form suggested.

I have no idea that there is any alliance such as has been suggested, and I have no sympathy with the theory that there are any grounds for suspicion as to motive or anything else. I assume that the Senator from Maine introduced the resolution simply because he wanted this information, and it was certainly competent for him to ask the Senate to make the inquiry if he saw fit. The only objection I have to his resolution is the form in which he puts it. I think, as he has already suggested as to another part of it, that this is accidental. Therefore, I suggest to him that we amend by striking out the words "Secretary of State" in line 2 and inserting the word "President;" then, at the beginning of line 3, insert "if not, in his opinion, incompatible with the public interest;" and in line 4, after the word "said" and before the word "seizure," insert the word "alleged." That will not change at all the spirit or purposes or scope of the resolution.

Mr. ALDRICH. "Directed" should be changed to "requested."

Mr. FORAKER. It reads "requested."

Mr. DAVIS. That was changed. It should be changed back.

Mr. FORAKER. I did not know that it had been changed. The word "requested" should remain. If it was stricken out and the word "directed" inserted, I ask that it be changed back to the word originally used.

Mr. HALE. Is the Senator from Ohio through?

Mr. FORAKER. Yes. Has the Senator from Maine any objection to those changes?

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, there never was presented to the Senate a clearer resolution simply of inquiry, propounding no facts, but merely stating that there were allegations upon which to base the resolution, than the one I hold in my hand. Every amendment which has been suggested to me has been readily accepted, because the amendments were of form and somewhat of substance; and yet they tended to shear the resolution of any possible objection. Still Senators are not satisfied. It is said that we should not put inquiries now while negotiations are going on with Great Britain. Negotiations! There is no treaty being negotiated. The Government undoubtedly has presented its request for the restoration of this property, and it is not a matter of give and take between the two powers, the Government of the United States and Great Britain. It is simply whether or not Great Britain is to-day disposed, instead of yielding to this request of ours, to delay and procrastinate after the fashion of British diplomacy; and if that is so, I want to know it. I think the Senate wants to know it. I know the country wants to know it.

I am not afraid, as the Senator from Connecticut is, that we shall overstep the bounds by passing this resolution, one simply of inquiry for information. I am not afraid we shall be doing the undiplomatic thing when we do this. But Senators are not content, no matter how the resolution is framed or is drawn or amended; but the determination is that it shall not pass the Senate. I do not know that it will pass the Senate. If for one will consent to no further amendments. I should like a vote of the Senate at once, and if we can get it I will take no more time upon this proposition to stifle the resolution by referring it to the Committee on Foreign Relations. If the Senate wants to do that, let it do it.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. FORAKER. I hope the Senator from Maine will not think I had in view any purpose of stifling his resolution. On the contrary, I tried to facilitate the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. HALE. I did not refer to the Senator from Ohio, of course.

Mr. FORAKER. I regret to hear the Senator announce that he will not accept the amendments which I suggested on the floor a moment ago. I trust he will reconsider that. It does not affect the substance of the resolution, and if he does not accept them, it will necessitate my moving that the resolution be so amended.

Mr. HALE. I will not. I like it better in its present form. The Senator can move the amendments, and if the Senate adopts them, that ends it. I want a vote of the Senate.

Mr. FORAKER. I move, then—

Mr. CHANDLER. A motion to refer is pending.

Mr. FORAKER. Does the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HALE. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. FORAKER. I move to strike out, in line 2, the words "Secretary of State" and insert "President;" at the beginning of line 3, to insert the words "if not, in his opinion, incompatible

with the public interest;" and by inserting the word "alleged" after the word "said" in line 4 and before the word "seizure."

Mr. DAVIS. At the present stage of the question I withdraw, with leave, the motion to refer the resolution to the committee.

Mr. HALE. I did not hear the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota withdraws the motion to refer the resolution to the committee. The resolution is now before the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BACON. I thought the Senator was through.

Mr. CHANDLER. The amendments of the Senator from Ohio are pending.

Mr. FORAKER. I had the floor to move an amendment.

Mr. BACON. I beg pardon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments proposed by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. CHANDLER. Let them be reported.

Mr. DAVIS. Let them be read.

Mr. HALE. Let them be read, but treated as one amendment instead of voting on each clause.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read for information.

The SECRETARY. In line 2, strike out the words "Secretary of State" and insert the word "President;" in the same line, strike out the word "directed" and insert "requested;" at the end of the line, after the word "Senate," insert "if not, in his opinion, incompatible with the public interests;" and in line 4, before the word "seizure," insert the word "alleged;" so that if amended the resolution would read:

Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the President is hereby requested to send to the Senate, if not, in his opinion, incompatible with the public interest, all information in possession of the State Department relating to said alleged seizure and detention, and also to inform the Senate what steps have been taken in requesting the restoration of property taken and detained as aforesaid.

Mr. HALE. Now let us have a vote.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I simply desire to say one word. I favor the amendment directing a request to the President.

I wish to suggest to the Senator from Maine that the practical effect is the same. I do not question whatever our right to direct the Secretary of State to furnish information, but in a matter whenever, in the opinion of the President, the information directed to be furnished by a Cabinet officer should not be conveyed to the Senate, there would doubtless be received by us from the President a communication to the effect that the information could not, in his opinion, be properly communicated to the Senate at this time. So, practically, it would be the same thing.

I do not conceive that the Senator from Colorado is entirely correct in his statement that in a case where the Senate directs a Cabinet officer, if it should be deemed by him improper or incompatible with the public interest that the information should be given, we would receive a reply of that kind from the Cabinet officer. A Cabinet officer should certainly never be considered as authorized to return such a reply.

I think that the reason why the Senate directs a Cabinet officer is not simply that this is a legislative body, but because it is also a part of the executive branch. Whenever that direction to a Cabinet officer would, if complied with, work a public harm, we would receive that information through the President. So, practically, it is the same, and I think, as originally was suggested by the senior Senator from Massachusetts, and as has been again suggested by the Senator from Ohio and others, it is decidedly better that this resolution should be made to accord with what is more proper usage, relating, as it does, to a matter concerning our foreign relations.

I hope, therefore, that the Senator from Maine will himself consent to this change, or rather not oppose it, in order that the resolution may be in such form as will meet the approval of all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair understand the Senator from Maine to accept the amendments?

Mr. HALE. It is a question for the Senate to accept it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendments proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER].

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is upon the preamble, the Chair is informed.

Mr. HALE. That will go with the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, such will be taken as the sense of the Senate.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BERRY. I asked unanimous consent that the Senate might consider a bill that will take only a few minutes, and I gave way to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR]. I now ask that the bill be considered.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator from Arkansas will allow me, I wish to make a privileged motion. It will take but a moment.

Mr. BERRY. I have given way three times, but if the Senator insists—

Mr. CHANDLER. Then I shall have to make it as a privileged motion. It is only that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet at 1 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I have another resolution on the table which came over from yesterday.

Mr. BERRY. I hope the Senator from South Dakota will let me have my bill passed. It will take but a few minutes. I will yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

HOUR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. CHANDLER. I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet at 1 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to.

PUBLIC RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES IN CUBA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a bill which he will indicate.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I do not wish to have the resolution to which I refer displaced and go to the Calendar at 2 o'clock; that is all.

Mr. CHANDLER. I will say to the Senator from Arkansas that the resolution which the Senator from South Dakota wants to have taken up is not objected to now, and it will take but a few moments, I think.

Mr. BERRY. All right; I will yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the resolution coming over from yesterday.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. PETTIGREW, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to send to the Senate an itemized statement of public receipts from taxation, customs, and all other sources, and also of public expenditures, including salaries paid to all officers and incidental expenses, in Cuba since the United States Government assumed control of that island.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the amendments for information.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed in line 3 of the resolution, after the word "sources," to insert the words "collected in Cuba;" and in line 5, after the word "Cuba," to insert "out of revenue so collected."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, the Senator from South Dakota will modify his own resolution, and the amendments are accepted as a part of the original resolution. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as modified.

The resolution as modified was agreed to.

CUBAN VESSELS.

Mr. BERRY. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 734) relating to Cuban vessels. I will state that the bill is a unanimous report from the Committee on Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read for information.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That vessels owned by citizens of Cuba and documented as such by officers of the United States shall hereafter be entitled in ports of the United States to the rights and privileges of vessels of the most favored nation, and they and their cargoes shall be subject to no higher charges in ports of the United States than are imposed on the vessels and cargoes of the most favored nation in the same trade.

Mr. BERRY. The committee recommend that the second section be stricken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection to the consideration of the bill at this time?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment, to strike out section 2 in the following words:

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to refund, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, upon application and satisfactory evidence, tonnage taxes and light dues which have been imposed on vessels owned by citizens of Cuba entering ports of the United States since January 1, 1899, which have been in excess of the tonnage taxes prescribed by section 11 of the act of June 19, 1886.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. With regard to the bill which has just passed, I see no objection to it, but I do want to say that

I think all measures relating to the island of Cuba and our relations to it should hereafter be referred to the committee which has that matter in charge.

Mr. BERRY. The bill was introduced by the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE], the Presiding Officer of the Senate; it was referred to the Committee on Commerce; it was taken up there for consideration; and I understood him to say, either about this bill or some other, that he had conferred with the chairman of the Committee on Relations with Cuba, and that that chairman had said it was best to let the Committee on Commerce dispose of the bill. It was unanimously recommended by all the members of the committee, after striking out the section which directed the repayment of the fees to the parties, and I was requested by the chairman to report it. That is all I know about it.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I am making no complaint, only I hope in the future that such bills will go to the proper committee.

AGREEMENT WITH BANNOCK AND SHOSHONE INDIANS.

Mr. SHOUP. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 255) to ratify an agreement made with the Indians of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, in Idaho, and making appropriation to carry the same into effect.

Mr. COCKRELL. Is that a bill on the Calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is No. 72 upon the Calendar. Is there any objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. COCKRELL. Let it be read for information, subject to objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read for information.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. LODGE. This bill, I understand, has passed the Senate at a previous session, and I ask that the further reading may be dispensed with. It is very nearly 2 o'clock.

Mr. COCKRELL. That can not be done. We can not dispense with its reading because of the fact that it was passed at a former session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rules of the Senate will not permit the reading to be dispensed with. The Secretary will proceed.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill and was interrupted by

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, it becomes the duty of the Chair to place before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 1) to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. SHOUP. I ask unanimous consent that the regular order be laid aside, so that the consideration of this bill may be concluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent is asked that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for the purpose of finishing the consideration of the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. ALDRICH. I feel obliged to object to that, Mr. President. Let this bill come up to-morrow.

Mr. SHOUP. Then I make the request that immediately after the routine business to-morrow morning the bill be taken up, the reading completed, and that it be put upon its passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Notice will be taken.

Mr. WELLINGTON. I beg leave to say in this connection that yesterday I gave notice that immediately after the morning business to-morrow I should desire to submit some remarks to the Senate on the joint resolution which I introduced, and I understood that that was the order.

Mr. SHOUP. I will say to the Senator from Maryland that, in my judgment, this bill will not occupy five minutes.

Mr. WELLINGTON. I understand that the Senate has agreed that when it adjourns to-day it shall be to meet at 1 o'clock to-morrow, and I should not like to be interfered with by this measure, as the time will be short.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of opinion that the special notice given by the Senator from Maryland will take precedence when the time arrives. The unfinished business will now be proceeded with.

THE FINANCIAL BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1) to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, in view of the great pressure thrown upon the Senate by the consideration of various measures, I feel it my duty to ask the Senate to fix a time for taking the vote upon the pending bill. I am sure this course will meet the convenience of all Senators, and I trust there will be no objection to the suggestion which I shall make.

I request that the vote may be taken upon the pending bill and

amendments on Thursday, the 1st day of February, at some time during the legislative day.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The Senator from Rhode Island knows very well that there are a number of Senators on this side who desire to be heard on this bill. A good many of them are engaged with matters of public importance that makes it impossible for them to prepare at once, as they might do if there was nothing before the Senate but this bill. But there are a number of other public questions of great importance in which almost all Senators are interested, and I do not think it is possible for this side of the Senate to be ready to take a vote on the bill as early as the time indicated by the Senator from Rhode Island. I suggest, as a substitute, that we agree to vote on the 15th of February, which I think will be satisfactory to all sides.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am extremely anxious to consult the convenience of Senators in regard to this matter and I understand the force of the remarks made by the Senator from Arkansas. With that in view, I accept the suggestion made by that Senator and will agree that the time shall be fixed for Thursday, the 15th of February, at some time during the legislative day.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. That will be entirely satisfactory, I think, to this side. There ought to be the further understanding, however, that the time after 2 o'clock from now until then shall be devoted to the consideration of this bill, if gentlemen desire to occupy the floor at any time.

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes; that should be the understanding. I agree with the Senator from Arkansas that that should be the understanding.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. There should be another thing understood, I think, Mr. President. There should be one or two days devoted to the discussion of amendments proposed to the bill under the ten-minute rule.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is right.

Mr. TELLER. Two days.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I should think we ought to have two full days on which amendments are to be discussed under the ten-minute rule. We all understand that as we approach the hour to vote it is often the case that there is not sufficient time to consider amendments that gentlemen desire to offer.

Mr. ALDRICH. I agree to that suggestion. I think it is very wise that there should be time given for the discussion of amendments under the ten-minute rule.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. With this understanding, I do not think there will be any difficulty about an agreement.

Mr. ALDRICH. Then the understanding, as I understand it, is that we shall vote upon this bill and pending amendments on Thursday—some time during Thursday—the 15th of February, and that two days prior to that time shall be given to the discussion—

Mr. ALLISON. Including the 15th.

Mr. ALDRICH. That two days, including the 15th, shall be given to the discussion of amendments under the ten-minute rule, with the further understanding that pending that time, or during the time between now and the 15th of February, this bill shall remain the unfinished business after 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state the request. It is that by unanimous consent it be agreed that the pending financial bill, House bill No. 1, shall be discussed from time to time as it is found expedient to do so, and that the final vote shall be taken upon its passage on February 15—

Mr. ALDRICH. Hardly "discussed from time to time as may be found expedient," Mr. President. It should be the regular order, as before.

Mr. SPOONER. Let the request be stated in the words in which it was taken down.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the request made by me be read by the stenographer. I think there will be no trouble about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Reporter will please read the request of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The Reporter read as follows:

Mr. ALDRICH. Then the understanding, as I understand it, is that we shall vote upon this bill and pending amendments on Thursday—some time during Thursday—the 15th of February, and that two days prior to that time shall be given to the discussion—

Mr. ALLISON. Including the 15th.

Mr. ALDRICH. That two days, including the 15th, shall be given to the discussion of amendments under the ten-minute rule, with the further understanding that pending that time, or during the time between now and the 15th of February, this bill shall remain the unfinished business after 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection to the proposed agreement as read?

Mr. BURROWS. I suggest to the Senator from Rhode Island whether it would not be well that we fix some time for the final vote on that day?

Mr. COCKRELL and others. No, no.

Mr. BURROWS. If it includes the legislative day, the legislative day may last a week or longer, and I suggest whether it would not be well to fix an hour for the final vote.

Mr. TELLER. We will vote before adjournment.

Mr. BURROWS. But I think we should fix some hour.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. As it has been agreed to discuss amendments for two days under the ten-minute rule, I think the Senate will get through the discussion on the amendments and there will be no reason then for postponing the vote a single hour; but if there should be amendments which Senators think of sufficient importance to be offered and which they wish to discuss, they are to be discussed on that day under the ten-minute rule, and I think the Senate ought to remain in session until the bill is disposed of.

Mr. BURROWS. I merely made the suggestion. I am afraid that the agreement will lead to a very protracted session on that day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection to the agreement as read by the Reporter, the same will be taken as the sense of the Senate. It is so ordered.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, the financial question has been before the American people for a quarter of a century. Other great questions are now coming to the front. These are questions that will tax our best efforts—questions so great that errors in judgment or a lack of conscience and courage to do our duty in respect to them may imperil our national existence, and concerning which if our mistakes are not fatal they are likely to be at least injurious to the American people.

But with all these other great questions before us we can not get rid of the monetary question, the greatest of all, because our ability to settle these other problems rightfully may depend on our success in dealing with the financial problem. This is true because a great number of intelligent men throughout the world believe the best interests of mankind require that the world should return to the bimetallic system; because all the commercial world is now disturbed by the attempt to displace nearly one-half of the metal money of the world without providing anything to take its place; because, in the language of the Republican platform of 1892, "the American people from tradition and interest are in favor of bimetalism;" because the American people are opposed to the gold standard and believe in the use of gold and silver as standard money.

Those who have been crying out for a decade that the silver question is dead and will "no longer vex the people of this or any other country," should remember, to use a trite phrase, that in free countries no question is settled until it is settled right.

It is possible the continued agitation of this question may disturb commerce and trade, that it may make the holders of money fear that the purchasing power of the dollar may be reduced, and their grip on the industrial energies and production of the country be weakened; but, be this as it may, the contest will go on. It will go on, because righteousness and justice are with those who contend for a system of finance that shall not impoverish one class, and that class the great bulk of society, that another and a smaller class may be enriched.

Mr. President, I always have some delicacy in discussing this question, because of the oft-repeated charge which has been made against myself and others who come from the silver-producing regions of the country, that we are controlled in our support of the bimetallic system by our local interests. That charge has been made against me repeatedly in the public press and sometimes on the floor of the Senate.

I represent in part one of the great precious-metal States of this Union—the greatest of them all at the present time. When I first came into this Chamber there was a greater production of gold in the State of Colorado than of silver, and for many years thereafter there was a greater production of silver than of gold; but upon this question I took my position when I came here, and I have not had occasion to doubt the correctness of my judgment at that time on the policy which the Government ought to pursue with reference to its finances.

At the present time Colorado is the greatest gold-producing State in the Union, having produced last year between thirty-three and thirty-four million dollars' worth of that metal. The State produced more than twice as much in value of gold as it did of silver. Indeed, Colorado is not only a great gold and silver producing State, but it is rich in all the metals, precious and otherwise. It contains great quantities of lead, copper, manganese, and zinc. Besides these, it has other great interests. Its agricultural interest is equal, if not greater, even at the present time, than its mining interest. I have thought it well to state these facts to convince you that the silver interest of the State is not paramount. If I know myself, I do not come here to discuss this question because the interests of the people of Colorado are involved in it.

I know, of course, that if silver was at its old price some of the mines in Colorado which are now closed would be opened; and I know, even though the amount of silver produced were no greater in weight than now, it would be worth in the markets of the world more than twice as much as it was last year. But, as I have said before, this is not a question for the people of one locality. It is not a question of what are the interests of the silver-producing

States, although I believe that may properly be kept in mind in legislating upon this subject.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY AND BIMETALLISM.

It has been my fortune to be in public life since this question became an active one. I recall the debates in the Senate and in the House of Representatives in 1877 and 1878. And looking back over the field, I think I may assert here without fear of contradiction that the American people are now and have been in favor of bimetalism.

Until very recently there was no political organization willing to take the position before the people of this country in opposition to bimetalism. The Republican party, with which I had been connected from its organization and with which I had acted during most of my public life, was until within the past few years a pronounced bimetallic party. Twenty-three years ago, if there was any distinction between the parties on this great question, the Republican party was the most enthusiastic and aggressive. I am speaking now of the rank and file of the people. All of our public men of both the great political parties have been declaring that they were opposed to the single gold standard. I know that a high and great question of this kind is to some extent belittled by considering, and it would seem beneath the dignity of this body to consider, what has been the action of a political organization on this subject.

Yet, Mr. President, because of my relations to it and because I have felt compelled, on account of the attitude of the political party with which I acted for so many years on this subject, to abandon it, I think it will not be inappropriate or out of place if I shall call attention to the course of the Republican party on this question during the last twenty-odd years. Whatever may be thought of the propriety or the policy of it, I feel that I must at least refer to it.

Mr. President, I represent a constituency who have studied this question. I represent a people composed of those who formerly were citizens of all sections of the United States, and I venture to say here, now, that there is to-day no more cosmopolitan society within the borders of the United States than that found in the State of Colorado; and, if it be not considered out of place, I would say that there is not to be found a greater number of men in any other section of the country who have more intelligence, more patriotism, and more learning than have the people of Colorado.

We are bimetalists in Colorado. There is no political organization there that does not declare for bimetalism. The Republican party there in their political conventions vie with the Democratic party, with the Silver Republicans, and the Populists in asserting that they are for bimetalism.

I recall that only a few years ago the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], standing in this Chamber, declared that 90 per cent of the people of the United States were in favor of bimetalism. The Senator from Massachusetts must have reconsidered his position, or else he must feel that this bill, offered by the party to which he belongs, is out of place in this body.

ORIGIN OF THE BILL.

I said the other day that this was a caucus measure. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] took me to task for that statement. I know, Mr. President, that in discussing a great measure of this kind to say that it is a caucus measure is not sufficient to condemn it. The question will be upon the merits of the proposition, and those I propose eventually to discuss. But there was something said by the chairman of the Committee on Finance in his discussion of the bill the other day, coupled with the subsequent declaration he made that he knew of nobody else on his side of the Chamber who intended to discuss the measure, which will justify me in speaking of this as a caucus measure.

I said then, and I now repeat, that perhaps it is not a caucus measure of Republicans who have got together and presented the bill as the result of their best judgment; but it is a measure that a junta of self-constituted political economists, as they call themselves, in the city of Indianapolis prepared for this Senate and House of Representatives. A Republican commission, appointed by the Republican caucus, accepted this, and it came to the House of Representatives—I speak now of the House bill—as the work, not of any one House committee, but as the work of a committee sitting at some watering place. It did not have the courtesy of the consideration of any House committee or of any member of a House committee. I do not think it is either out of place or improper to characterize this proceeding as the most remarkable in the history of legislative bodies.

Mr. President, the student of history will declare that this is a departure from and an abdication of legislative judgment, when a committee composed of half a dozen men ignorant upon this question—for their ignorance is shown by almost every line that they have ever written—shall be able to present a bill to the great legislature of the United States and it will accept it without even the consideration of a committee. If this is not an abandonment

of the legislative function and a surrender to outside political influences there never was an abandonment or a surrender.

This bill came from the other House to this body after only a week's discussion there. In the Senate it went to the Committee on Finance, which we have selected to pass upon financial questions. I do not think I shall be outside the bounds of truth if I say that that committee, as a committee, never considered the pending bill an hour; that it was never considered in committee with the cooperation of those of its members of different political faith than its framers.

Mr. President, this bill is here dictated by influences not legislative; and when I stand here to protest against it, no man knows better than I do that the great political party in power and dominating this Senate and the country has surrendered its judgment and its conscience to that outside influence, and yet that it will receive the almost united support of that political organization.

I know very well that the policy of the bill is contrary to the repeated declarations of that party in convention and out. It will be different from their action in this Chamber and in the other for twenty years. But that party is in the hands of a power from which it can not escape, and it will go on and put upon the statute books this legislation, because it is impotent to resist that power, although the proposed legislation may be, and I know is, against the judgment of very many Senators of that political party.

Up to 1896 the Republican party in this country was a bimetallic party. In 1888 it declared for silver. I will go back of that time and I call attention to the legislation of 1876, when a large number of Republicans, a majority of them in the House of Representatives, were in favor of the free coinage of silver. I will call attention to the fact that the most prominent men then sitting in the other House voted for that measure. I will also call attention to the further fact that the present Chief Executive of the nation as late as 1890 was writing letters to his constituents in the State of Ohio and asserting as a merit in his public service that he had voted for that bill.

In 1890 the country was suffering from a lack of money, and when the House of Representatives was not in full accord with the Senate upon this question, when the Senate passed the free-coinage bill, the Republican party as a party, acting together in this body and in the other House, framed and secured the passage of the statute known as the Sherman Act of July 14, 1890. That was an act professedly in the interest of bimetalism; but I did not believe then that it was a judicious act to pass. Still it had in it some redeeming qualities. It was professedly, I say, in the interest of bimetalism. The Republican party was then vying with the Democratic party as to which should be the most extreme in favor of bimetalism. The only objection made here against free coinage by Republicans in the twenty-odd years I have been familiar with this legislation has been simply that it was a hindrance to bimetalism. The most extreme gold men of to-day who were then in this Chamber were wont to assert that we were rendering it impossible to secure bimetalism by our extreme action. That end, they said, was not to be attained through free coinage.

I have a few extracts from the platforms of the different Republican conventions of the United States from time to time on this question, but I do not care to read them. I will ask permission that I may put them in the RECORD. I ask this privilege in justification of what I have here said, and also in justification of my continuance in the Republican party so long as I did remain in it. If the Republican party in 1880 had declared it was a gold-standard party, I should have severed my connection with it then. There are few men in public life who have had more honors at the hands of their political party than I have had at the hands of the Republican party; but I received those honors, Mr. President, because I was supposed to represent Republican ideas and Republican principles. I have advocated the free coinage of silver on every stump in the State from which I come, and there has never until within the last two years been a convention in Colorado of either Democrats or Republicans that has not declared for the free coinage of silver; and while there has been some letting down, perhaps, in one direction, still all parties now declare for bimetalism.

I will say that I have here the declarations of the Republican conventions of Iowa, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, Oregon, and Pennsylvania. I will not say that Pennsylvania declared for free coinage, but that State did declare for "the use of silver and gold." I have also the declarations of South Dakota, Tennessee, Wyoming, California, Colorado, Michigan, and others.

Mr. President, I will now send up the extracts which I desire to have printed as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERKINS in the chair). The extracts referred to by the Senator from Colorado will, without objection, be printed as a part of his remarks.

The extracts referred to are as follows:

Michigan Republicans in 1890: We indorse the action of Congress upon the silver question and favor the unlimited use of gold and silver as the basis of legal-tender paper currency interchangeable with coin.

Nebraska, 1890 or 1891: The Republican party has given the people an elastic currency of gold, silver, and paper, and has raised the credit of the nation to one of the highest pitch of any country in the world, and its efforts to fully remonetize silver should be continued until it is on a perfect equality as a money metal with gold.

The New York Republican State convention in 1890-91 commended the Administration for "the prompt restoration of silver to its normal place in the commercial world."

Ohio, 1891: Approved of the action of Congress in fulfilling pledges of the party in legislation upon the coinage of silver, revision of the tariff, etc.

Oregon, April 16, 1891: We declare ourselves in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of silver and denounce any attempt to discriminate against silver as unwise and unjust.

Pennsylvania, June 25, 1891: Favored the use of both gold and silver.

Iowa Republicans in their platform of 1893: We are in favor of maintaining both gold and silver money as unlimited legal tender for the payment of debts; and in doing this Congress shall provide that every dollar, whether gold, silver, or paper, shall be kept of equal value.

Kansas, 1892: Favors such laws as will increase the coinage of silver. Approval of international bimetalism.

Missouri Republican convention, 1892: Favors international bimetalism.

Montana, 1892: Free and unlimited coinage of silver.

Nebraska, 1893: Adopts the national platform of 1892 as to the silver question.

Nevada: Free and unlimited coinage of silver.

Oregon: Indorses the Sherman bill.

Pennsylvania, 1893: Reaffirms the national platform on the money question and demands \$40 per capita.

South Dakota, 1892: Reaffirms the national platform on silver.

Tennessee, 1892: Approves of the Sherman Act.

Wyoming, 1892: The money of the country should be founded on gold and silver, and this may be achieved by timely legislation—international conference.

California, 1892: We believe silver, equally with gold, to be the money of the people.

Colorado, 1892: Free and unlimited coinage of silver.

THE ST. LOUIS CONVENTION AND THE PRESIDENT'S ATTITUDE.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, with this record I remained in the Republican party. I went to St. Louis as a delegate to the national Republican convention, authorized by the people of my State to go there, instructed by them to stand for the free coinage of silver. That there should be no misunderstanding where I stood, I telegraphed the convention that under no circumstances, whether I was a delegate or not, would I support a candidate who did not stand on a bimetallic platform and who did not favor the use of silver and gold on equal terms.

I had doubted before I went to St. Louis whether such a declaration would be made by that convention, but this was not because the candidate who it was recognized would be nominated was opposed to silver, for all his utterances in public and in private life had been in favor of bimetalism. As I have said, he had voted for free coinage, and when the bill was amended here in this body so as not to be a free-coinage bill, but yet to be a bill that was claimed to be more in the line of securing what we all wanted, the concurrent action of mankind on this question, the international obligation of all people to continue the use of silver—when it was said that was more potent in that direction than the other, and when the President of the United States vetoed the bill, because he said its passage and its execution would be a breach of public faith—the present Executive, then a member of the House of Representatives, voted to pass that bill over the veto.

I think before the convention met at St. Louis it was as well understood that Mr. McKinley would be the Republican candidate for the Presidency as it was when the convention adjourned. We had a right from his declarations to suppose that his influence would be in favor of bimetalism. The State from which he came, in its convention, had passed a resolution on that subject, which I shall read. It was passed on the 11th day of March, 1896, and is as follows:

We contend for honest money, for a currency of gold, silver, and paper with which to measure our exchanges that shall be as sound as the Government and as untarnished as its honor; and to that end we favor bimetalism and demand the use of both gold and silver as standard money, either in accordance with a ratio to be fixed by an international agreement, if that can be obtained, or under such restrictions and such provisions to be determined by legislation as will secure the maintenance of the parities of value of the two metals, so that the purchasing and debt-paying power of the dollar, whether of silver, gold, or paper, shall be at all times equal.

That was a bimetallic declaration, which went out from the State of Ohio, where the Presidential candidate lived, and we had some right to suppose that that might be the national declaration. When I reached St. Louis I was told by a number of prominent men that that would be the platform. There are men I can recall who remember that conversation, to whom I said, "No such declaration will be in your platform; your party is under the control and in the hands of men who do not intend to have bimetalism, either national or international."

Mr. President, of late there has been a quarrel among leading Republicans of this country as to who should be awarded the honor of securing this change in the policy of that great political party; as to who should have the honor of repudiating the Ohio resolution and adopting one recognizing, in the first place, the gold standard as existing in this country, and then declaring that it shall be maintained, at the same time asserting that it is not the most desirable standard in the world, but that when somebody else, some foreign power, shall be kind enough to allow us,

the greatest people in the world, to direct our own financial system, then it may be changed and we should have the bimetallic standard. The convention of 1888 had declared for silver. I believe I can put my eye upon that declaration, and I will read it. In 1888 at Chicago—I believe I shall commit no impropriety if I say it—the distinguished Senator from Nevada who sits nearest me [Mr. STEWART] procured the insertion in the platform of this provision:

The Republican party is in favor of the use of both gold and silver as money, and condemns the policy of the Democratic Administration in its efforts to demonetize silver.

That was in the closing part of Mr. Cleveland's first Administration. Everybody who has kept at all in touch with the history of this country well understands that Mr. Cleveland's principal object in financial affairs was to put this country on a gold basis. I know that there was some pretense even then with Mr. Cleveland and his party that they wanted to put this country on a gold basis that they might eventually get to the bimetallic standard; and that is about the proposition advanced by the Senator from Rhode Island in the speech made by him the other day. He is not quite willing to admit that he has given up the idea of the bimetallic system, but he hopes to get it through the adoption of the gold standard first.

In 1892, when Mr. Harrison was renominated for the Presidency, this is what the Republican party declared:

The American people, from tradition and interest, favor bimetalism, and the Republican party demands the use of both gold and silver as standard money, with such restrictions and under such provisions, to be determined by legislation, as will secure the maintenance of the parity of values of the two metals so that the purchasing and debt-paying power of the dollar, whether of silver, gold, or paper, shall be at all times equal.

When Mr. Harrison wrote his letter of acceptance September 3, 1892, he said:

The resolution of the convention in favor of bimetalism declares, I think, the true and necessary condition of a movement that has upon these lines my cordial adherence and support. I am thoroughly convinced that the free coinage of silver at such a ratio to gold as will maintain the equality in their commercial uses of the two coined dollars would conduce to the prosperity of all the great producing and commercial nations of the world. * * *

With that declaration Mr. Harrison received the support, in the State of Colorado, of very many Republicans who had doubted his fidelity, perhaps, to the bimetallic system. In fact, there has never yet been a Republican President until the present Executive who has declared in favor of the single gold standard. Every one of them has been a bimetalist since I have been in public life.

I have a quotation from Mr. Garfield's inaugural address:

By the experience of commercial nations in all ages it has been found that gold and silver afford the only safe foundation for a monetary system.

I suppose nobody will dispute that the Republican party up to 1896 asserted itself as a bimetallic party. I do not suppose that anybody who has read this bill will contend that it is now a bimetallic party, and especially when it is known that the party has surrendered to the Indianapolis junta. The President of the United States surrendered to that concern in 1897. I will have occasion later to refer to the message he sent here, in which he recommended for our consideration the action of this intelligent convention, which, he said, had given "two whole days" to this great question and had concluded that gold was the only safe standard.

The campaign of 1896 was not made by the Republican party on a gold-standard basis. I speak whereof I know. I made speeches in ten States of the Union, and I alleged everywhere I went that that was not an honest declaration which said we will maintain the gold standard in this country until the principal commercial nations shall agree to an international arrangement, which we promise to promote. Everywhere I went I was challenged. It was said that I was slandering the Republican party; that the Republican party was a bimetallic party; that the only way to get bimetalism was through international agreement.

INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT.

I wish to say a word on the question of international agreement. I have repeatedly said in the Senate that if we could secure an international agreement, it was the most desirable thing in the world to do. I am one of those who recognize the fact that if we can maintain bimetalism alone, all the world can maintain it better by acting in accord, and so, from time to time, I have favored and have done my part, I believe, to secure international bimetalism through international conferences. I did not object to that provision in itself, but I did object to it because it seemed to me to be utterly inconsistent with the other provision—that the gold standard should be maintained.

If the gold standard was not the best standard, if the gold-standard system was one that we desired to get rid of, why should we not get rid of it? It was a declaration in the national platform of the lack of power on our part to control our own affairs. I said in the convention that it was the first time in the history of this country that the American people had declared their inability to take care of themselves. We fix our tariff as we choose. We frame our foreign-intercourse laws as we think they ought to be;

but when it comes to the question of finance, which touches the people more closely than any other, we abdicate our great power and turn it over, so far as metallic money is concerned, to foreign nations. When we shall have enacted this bill, which turns over to the banks of the country the balance of the money control in this country, we will be a people to be despised by all mankind.

There is a great deal of—I will not say ignorance, but perhaps I might use that word—there is a great deal of misrepresentation, at least, as to this question, growing out of ignorance or what is worse; and it is in this that we have found one trouble in dealing with it. We have had people stand before us *ex cathedra*, as if there was no questioning their statements, and tell us that we could not maintain the double standard, or silver and gold, in this country unless we had the assistance of somebody else. Then they have misrepresented history. They have declared over and over again that we could not point to any condition that existed anywhere where bimetallicism has prevailed where there was not an alternating system of gold one year and silver the next.

GOLD AND SILVER IN HISTORY.

If I may refer to some other place, recently in debate it was declared that certain persons stood for gold, unchangeable gold, gold that was always a dollar. The man who makes that statement writes himself down as unacquainted with history, financial and otherwise.

Not long ago, in 1896, in the great city of Boston, a man who had sat in this Chamber, a man who had presided over the Treasury Department, who had twice been governor of his State, before as intelligent an audience as could be assembled in the United States, declared that gold has always been the standard of value—the standard, he said, amongst the highly civilized and amongst the savages alike, the only measure of value in the present and in the past. Those people had a right to believe that he was telling the truth. They had the right to suppose that his statements were based on historical facts. There was not a word of truth in the statement. History denies every assertion he made on this point. It can be shown by the most indisputable authority that for nearly eight hundred years practically no gold was coined in all Europe. It can be shown that when he was governor of Massachusetts the great majority of mankind was standing on the silver standard.

It could be shown from authorities not to be disputed or maligned that gold was but merchandise in Europe, outside of England and Portugal, until 1848. History declares that the English people never coined a dollar of gold until after the year 1800. Rogers, a great authority upon this question, in his *Industrial and Commercial History of England*, declares that no gold was coined in that country until 1326, and practically none until after the beginning of the seventeenth century. Gold was not the standard in England until 1816; it was practically not the standard, only by law, till 1821. The other day I looked over the testimony taken before the committee of Parliament in 1810—and if anybody wants to challenge the authority, I will bring it here and show it to him.

Before that committee it was stated repeatedly that gold was but an article of merchandise in Holland, in Germany, practically in all continental Europe; that the Bank of Hamburg had declined to loan money on gold bars, because the authorities said they would be called upon to pay silver, and they could not always get silver with gold. I do not mean to say that gold did not do money duty. It has done money duty more or less, in my judgment, since before any history records the transactions of men. I believe I can demonstrate that more than two thousand two hundred years before the Christian era it had a relation established by law in China, and it is indisputably proved that fifteen hundred years before the Christian era law had fixed the relation in India between gold and silver; but silver from that time to 1848 was the standard of the majority of mankind.

These are not unsustained assertions of mine; no man who is acquainted with the political and economic history of the world can deny them. They can be proved by all history. Gold was preferred, I will admit, in the Asiatic countries, not because it was money, but because it was an article of adornment and beauty. It was used as a valuable measure of exchange in the early history of the world, and yet silver has been the money of the great majority of the peoples.

And to-day the man who declares that gold is the standard of the world and measures the values of the world makes a statement that he can not support. To-day there are more men who look to silver as money to measure the relations of commodities to each other than there are who look to gold.

We are told often that gold is the money of the rich and respectable nations and that we must put ourselves in line; that we must get a relation to that metal because it is used by the wealthy people of the world. There is nothing in that. Up to 1871 the great commercial nations of the world were on the silver standard. Great Britain, as I said, went to the gold standard nominally in 1816; Portugal, I think, in 1854, if my memory is correct, but the

date is immaterial. In 1870 there were two Christian nations of the world that had gold as their standard. One was Great Britain, and the other was Portugal, and there was no other nation, heathen or Christian, that had that standard.

Yet we are repeatedly told by public officials, and the people have been led to believe that it is true, that we are attempting to force upon the country a metal which has been discredited for all time, a money that is incapable of doing money duty, when, I repeat, the history of the world shows that silver has been the money of commerce; silver has been the money under which the human race has made its progress and its upheaval and uplifting, and not gold. It is the money of the masses, it is the money of mankind, and to-day, I repeat, it is the money of more than one-half the human race.

THE HOUSE BILL.

Mr. President, I had not intended to be very lengthy in some things which I wished to say to-day. There is another feature to this case which I shall present at some other time. I want to take up this bill, omitting some things that I should say; for I think if I were to attempt to go into all the points that present themselves, I would lengthen my remarks beyond what I desire. I shall avail myself of the privilege which fortunately we all have, and which I hope we shall maintain in this body, of freely expressing our sentiments when a bill is before the body. If free expression can be thwarted in committee or in caucus, when a measure comes here it can have the untrammelled consideration of the American Senate.

I want to deal with the House bill, and I mean to deal with it as rapidly as I can. I had thought I would take up one phase of the subject on which the public perhaps has been somewhat misinformed. Every little while you see in public prints a reference to "prophecies unrealized." It is stated that we predicted that immense disasters would come to this country from the gold standard and that those predictions have not been realized. On some other occasion I think I will consider that subject. I have some prophecies on the other side which have not been realized to which I desire to refer, but I will not do so this afternoon, because I am somewhat hoarse, and because I think if I attempted it I would go to greater length than I should.

I want to ask before I take up the bill—it seems to me it is a proper and pertinent inquiry—what is the demand for it? Whence does it come? Who is pressing it? Is the gold standard here now? Have we the gold standard? The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] would tell me we have. The Secretary of the Treasury declares we have. He is the mouthpiece of the President on all these questions. The gold-standard press declare we have it; but they are not all united on this question. For instance, the New York Sun, formerly a Democratic paper, but now a very strong Republican Administration paper, has repeatedly in its columns declared that there is no sense in the bill. Have the toilers and laborers of the country demanded this legislation, this renewed agitation that we hear so much about, which disturbs the business of the country? We have been told for many years, every time we introduced a bill touching the currency, that it had a tendency to disturb business affairs, and that we ought not to do it. Is it in accordance with the Republican platform of 1896? The Republicans simply said the gold standard should be maintained. That is a declaration that it is here.

Mr. President, there is more in this bill than the maintenance of the gold standard. The gold standard, if the Secretary of the Treasury is correct, does not need any further legislation. It is already fixed, and I know some people say it is fixed by Executive act. But if that is true, it is not here. The Executive has no right to fix the gold standard on this country. If it is here, it is here by virtue of law, or it is not here at all. But the party that asserts that it is here ought to give some excuse why it wants to reaffirm the fact. Why do you want to repeat it? Why do you want to say, as is said in the House bill, "that the standard unit of value shall, as now, be the dollar, and shall consist of 25.8 grains of gold?" It is now the dollar. It has been a dollar of gold since 1873, but it did not make the gold standard. The first dollar that we ever had was a silver dollar. That did not make the silver standard.

Does anybody mean to say here in this Chamber that because Congress adopted the gold dollar as the unit it gave us the gold standard? If so, we must have had a silver standard from 1792 to 1873. We did not have. We had the bimetallic standard. We had a silver dollar that stood as the unit. The dollar was the unit. The dollar is the unit now, and it does not make any difference what it is made of. The silver dollar is not the unit. It is the dollar which is the unit of expression—a place to start from, to make the calculations from. The pound sterling for hundreds of years had no representative at all in coin. The pound sterling was the measure by which anything was calculated, and yet there was no such coin in England until modern times, since the gold standard was established, when the sovereign was created.

I do not care whether we have got the gold standard—and I am not now going to discuss it—but we have not got the gold standard as we will have it under this bill. We have about \$500,000,000 of silver doing money duty, and doing it well and nobly. I hope to show, before we get through, that it will no longer be doing money duty as it is now doing, measuring values, the equal of gold, every dollar of the same value, every dollar equal to a gold dollar. What is the matter with the silver dollar now, that both the Senate bill and the House bill should provide that it shall be practically destroyed?

The silver dollar has bought from the day it was first coined in this country as much as any gold dollar ever bought, and part of the time it bought 3 per cent more. We prepared for the issue of silver dollars in 1878, under the direction of the Senator who sits before me [Mr. ALLISON]. We heard then in this Chamber that those would be cheap dollars. We heard a distinguished Senator from Vermont say to the Senate with great solemnity, "If you pass this bill, you will sell no more United States bonds except at a great discount. All your customs and revenues, internal and otherwise, will be paid in this depreciated money." We commenced coining these despised dollars when there was a difference of between 8 and 12 per cent between the greenback and the gold dollar, and I state what can not be denied now, that the first dollar which came out of the mint under that law was equal to any gold dollar in this land and that the Treasury Department began to exchange these dollars at once for gold.

And yet there was never a Secretary who did not tell us that we ought to stop coining silver for fear it would be cheap. The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Sherman, on the 4th day of April (this act had passed on the 28th of February), stated before the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which Mr. Bruckner was at that time the chairman, that he was exchanging silver dollars for gold. The Senator from Missouri in 1893 called upon the Secretary of the Treasury to tell us how many of the silver dollars and silver certificates had been exchanged for gold, and he said he could not tell how much had been exchanged for gold between the passage of the bill and 1880, and so there he commences. Mr. Carlisle, in a communication that he made to this body while Secretary, stated that from 1879 up to that hour there had been frequent interchanges of silver for gold, not to redeem the silver, but that men who had gold had gone to the Treasury and put it in and taken out silver.

Let me read what Mr. Sherman said. I know the impression has gone out to many people that it has been difficult to keep silver on an equality with gold and that there has been an effort in that direction, and I have heard Senators say that it could not have been done but by the declaration of the act of 1893. That act, so far as that is concerned, had no influence whatever on this question.

Not a dollar of silver has ever yet been redeemed in gold. Mr. Sherman was asked by Mr. Ewing, of Ohio:

Do you expect to pay out the silver dollar coined by you for current expenses, or only for coin liabilities, or to hoard it for resumption?

Now, mind you, at that time, in the spring of 1878, we had not resumed specie payments, and there was still a divergence between the greenback and gold, but, I repeat, none between silver and gold. Let us see what Mr. Sherman said about it:

I expect to pay it out now only in exchange for gold coin or for silver bullion. I am perfectly free to answer the question fully, because on that point, after consulting with many members of both Houses, I have made up my mind what the law requires me to do. I propose to issue all the silver dollars that are demanded in exchange for gold coin. That has been going on to some extent; how far I can not tell. Then I propose to use the silver in payment for silver bullion, which I can do at par with gold. I then propose to buy all the rest of the silver bullion which I need under the law with silver coin.

Now, I state a fact that nobody will deny—if anyone does deny it, I will furnish the proof—that from that hour there has never been a time when there has been any difference between silver and gold except during the panic of 1893, when silver was sold in the city of New York for 3 per cent more than gold. Why, Mr. President? Simply because it was the most convenient money to use for the people who wanted to pay their workmen, not because they had any greater desire to use it.

I refer to the report from the Secretary of the Treasury on the call of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL]. I will say to Senators if they want to see it, it is Executive Document No. 29, Fifty-third Congress, first session. This report shows that between September 18, 1880, and the last day of the year 1884 the exchanges of silver dollars for gold was \$80,403,910. In 1880 the Treasury Department issued a circular saying that it would exchange if anybody brought his gold. I do not remember the exact terms; but they said if persons brought their gold to the Treasury, they could get silver dollars for it, and it is under that circular that this deposit was made.

In January, 1885, that circular was withdrawn; the public were denied the opportunity of carrying their gold to the Treasury and exchanging it for silver dollars. That year, 1885, is only credited

with the amount that came in during the month of January, which is \$575,090, but afterwards the exchange seems to have been resumed.

Mr. President, during that time the Treasury had plenty of gold to pay for the greenbacks, if anybody wanted them, and during that time, when the public were taking their gold and going to the Treasury Department and getting silver dollars, they could have taken their greenbacks and coin to the Treasury and got gold. During that whole time the total amount of greenbacks that went to the Treasury in exchange for gold was only \$4,167,388.

Now, then, during the years 1887, when this exchange began, and in 1888 and 1889, the report No. 29, which I have referred to, shows that there were \$11,457,842 of silver certificates exchanged for gold. Secretary Carlisle says:

For subsequent years—

that is, after 1889—

there is no data to determine the amount so exchanged

But he thinks not over \$3,000,000 per annum.

He further says:

Silver dollars have been exchanged for gold or paper redeemable in gold from 1879 to the present time—

That was in 1893 when he was writing—

but the amount of the various classes previous to 1887 can not be given.

When a man took gold to the Treasury and got a silver certificate, he got practically a silver dollar, for he got the paper that called for a silver dollar; but these are standard silver dollars. Between 1887 and 1889, inclusive, three years, the total amount of standard silver dollars so exchanged for gold was \$29,021,280. The Secretary says "for subsequent years the data is not complete," but he thinks about the same as in the last three years, or about \$9,673,763 per annum.

The Secretary then gives the total amount of silver certificates exchanged for gold at \$100,436,842, and the total number of silver dollars exchanged for gold at \$67,421,290, or a total of silver certificates and silver dollars exchanged for gold at \$167,858,132.

Now, Mr. President, all this time every Secretary of the Treasury, acting under an influence that does not emanate in Washington, had been telling us that the silver dollar was not an honest dollar and had been predicting that it would fall in its value in a little while, and that its purchasing power then being equal to gold it could not be maintained. And yet the people who had \$167,000,000 of gold went to the Treasury with it and turned it into the Treasury and said, "Let us have these cheap silver dollars." Why? They knew that the statement that they were cheap was false. They knew that as long as this great country needed money, with its immense commerce and its immense trade, there was no trouble but what the silver dollar would be the equal of the gold dollar as long as it was equal in debt-paying power.

PARITY.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado a question.

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Did the Treasury Department ever redeem a silver dollar or a silver certificate in gold?

Mr. TELLER. Never, not up to this time, Mr. President. That has never been done to this hour. Mr. Carlisle did say that if it were necessary to maintain the parity, he would do it, but there was no necessity to do it to maintain the parity.

People talk a good deal about maintaining the parity as if there was some great obligation of the Government to maintain the parity between these two kinds of metals. Now, the interchangeability between metals should be left to commerce. It is left there by every well-regulated government. You can not go to the Bank of France and take your silver there and get gold, nor can you take your gold there and get silver unless you make a merchandise affair of the exchange. If you carry your gold there and say you want silver, they will charge you for giving you silver; but if you carry the bank notes there, the bank officers will give you whichever they think you ought to have, and that depends upon which they have the most of and which they think they can spare the easiest.

Mr. President, in spite of the slander and misrepresentation that has been uttered from this Chamber and the other and from the officials, the parity of our silver dollars has been maintained because the country needed them as money, because they knew that they would perform the great function of interchange in this country in every commercial center, and because they knew more than that. We knew there was not a country on the face of the earth where civilized men live where it was not the equal of a gold dollar. I recall that one year Henry Clews & Co. issued a circular in which they said the value of the silver dollar in London is, well, I will say, 90 cents. I do not know what it was; it may have been 80 cents. I wrote a note to that distinguished house and said if they knew of any chance to buy silver dollars over there at that figure I would be very glad to have the entire lot; that I could find people who would take them. "Oh, well,"

they said, "they meant the price paid for the silver in a dollar and not the dollar itself."

Well, Mr. President, it may be that when that dollar gets over there it is no longer a dollar, but the man who holds it in his hands knows there is a place where it is a dollar. He knows that back in the United States anything that he wants he can buy with that dollar. Do you suppose he is going to be fool enough to carry it to a broker and sell it at a figure that practically reduces it to bullion? Not at all, Mr. President. I will admit that that would not be the condition if this country were a small, one-horse affair, if we did not have a great commerce, and all the world was not wanting to trade with us. In that case it could not be done; but I beg the Senate to understand that from my standpoint the American nation is a bigger nation than most of the nations of the world.

I have not lost sight of the fact myself that we have almost 80,000,000 people; I have not lost sight of the fact that our internal and external commerce beats that of any other 80,000,000 people on the face of the earth two to one; and we count in the world's affairs in commerce as if there were a population of 200,000,000 here. We are consumers and producers as no other people in the world are. The best authorities that I have seen, and I believe they are reliable, declare that American consumption is two and a half times greater per capita than that of the other most-favored nations of the world. It has been so, Mr. President, for all time almost since we have been a nation, and why? Because we have had a condition here under every Administration that ever existed better than they have had anywhere else in the world. We have had a great uncultivated continent; we have had wealth such as no other three and one-half million square miles have had. Here was the place where every man who wanted to labor could get compensation for his labor; here was the place for the man who would not labor and wanted to use his brains.

Oh, Mr. President, when people talk about waiting until the principal commercial nations of the earth agree that we may do this or that, I want to say to them the American people are big enough and great enough to do anything that their judgment tells them they ought to do, and they are righteous enough never to do that which would dishonor them or degrade them in the estimation of the decent elements of mankind.

If we should go to the use of silver and find it was not honest, we would back out. But we are not willing that the chairman of the Committee on Finance and his associates shall assume a condition and then say to us, as he said the other day, "You are not bimetalists; you are for the single silver standard." He did not include me, because he said the Democrats were of that stamp, but he might have included me, because he knew that on this question I am in accord with them. Now, sir, I do not believe that here or anywhere else the Senator will say that there is anything in my public life that leads him to believe I am not as sensitive of American honor as he or any other man, wherever he may live.

I may be mistaken as to what would be the result if we went to free coinage, but the history of the ages is with me. We have tried it. It has been tried by almost every country in the world. Every civilized land has tried it, and it has never failed.

Mr. President, at some other time I mean to take up this phase of the question, "Can a nation maintain silver and gold in its currency at the same time?" and I will prove to you and to the world that the repeated assertion made in this Chamber and elsewhere that we could not do it and that we did not do it is not true. We did it magnificently until the demand for silver was so great in Asia that they had there a ratio of 15 ounces of silver to 1 of gold, and they took away ours because it was more profitable to send it there than to keep it here.

I will prove that France, England, and the United States, all those countries, maintained the circulation of both coins of silver and gold, and that this repeated statement that you can not do it is not supported by history. There is not time to go into that question to-night. The next section of this bill reads:

SEC. 2. That all interest-bearing obligations of the United States for the payment of money, now existing or hereafter to be entered into, and all United States notes and Treasury notes issued under the law of July 14, 1890, shall be deemed and held to be payable in the gold coin of the United States as defined in section 1 of this act; and all other obligations, public and private, for the payment of money shall be performed in conformity with the standard established in said section.

Now, that provision takes all our bonds and our greenbacks. It takes every obligation that this Government has out, it does not make any difference what it is. All obligations are to be paid in gold. Of course I know that in the first section there is the following provision:

Nothing herein contained shall be construed or held to affect the present legal-tender quality of the silver dollar, or of the subsidiary or minor coins, or of the paper currency of the United States, or the laws making national bank notes receivable and payable for certain public debts and dues and obligations between national banks.

This is absolutely contradictory; it is the exception, perhaps it

may be said; but before I get through I shall attempt to show that there is a way and that it is the intent of this bill to make every obligation exchangeable for gold.

SEC. 3. That there be established in the Treasury Department, as a part of the office of the Treasurer of the United States, a division to be designated and known as the division of issue and redemption.

Then it provides what shall be transferred to it. I think, perhaps, as a matter of working affairs in the Treasury, the formation of a division and the reference to it of some things may be right. I have no complaint of that.

There shall be transferred from the general fund in the Treasury of the United States and taken up on the books of said division as a redemption fund the amount of gold coin and bullion held against outstanding gold certificates, the amount of United States notes held against outstanding currency certificates, the amount of silver dollars held against outstanding silver certificates, the amount in silver dollars and silver bullion held against outstanding Treasury notes issued under the act of July 14, 1890; and an amount of gold coin and bullion to constitute a reserve fund equal to 25 per cent of the amount.

Mr. President, if there is no objection, I should like to suspend here and take this subject up to-morrow. I do not want to intrude upon anyone else, but there is one phase of this question that I intended to have taken up which I have omitted and to which I shall devote some time in the morning, perhaps, or perhaps I shall not take it up at all. If it is necessary for me to go on so as not to be in the way of some one else, I can continue; but I do not know that anyone cares to go on to-night or that anyone cares to go on to-morrow. If they do, I should not want to be in the way of anyone to-morrow, and I should prefer to go on now.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is not advised that any reservations have been made for to-morrow on this bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. No notice has been given, and I know of no other Senator who expects to speak on the bill to-morrow.

Mr. TELLER. I wish to say to the Senator from Rhode Island that I do not desire to delay anything, and I do not want to postpone my remarks until others who are not yet ready may be at all inconvenienced. But I have talked for some time to-day, and I am ready to suspend.

Mr. ALDRICH. So far as I know, there will be no objection at all to the Senator from Colorado going on at 2 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. TELLER. Of course I can go on now if it is at all desired.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I know of no one on this side who wants to take the floor to-morrow. I think there will be no difficulty in the Senator from Colorado getting the floor to-morrow.

Mr. TELLER. Then I will suspend until to-morrow.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After twenty-seven minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 18, 1900, at 1 o'clock p. m.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 17, 1900.

CONSULS.

Martin J. Carter, of Pennsylvania, to be consul of the United States at St. Johns, Newfoundland.

Alexander Wood, of Pennsylvania, to be consul of the United States at Kehl, Germany.

George L. Darte, of Pennsylvania, now consul at Martinique, to be consul of the United States at Patras, Greece.

Alonzo C. Yates, of Virginia, now consul at Patras, to be consul of the United States at Martinique, West Indies.

PROMOTION IN THE MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

P. A. Surg. George M. Magruder, of New York, to be a surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

Frederick E. Trotter, of New York, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

Frank J. Thornbury, of New York, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

Joseph W. Schereschewsky, of New York, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

Thomas B. McClintic, of New York, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

John M. Holt, of New York, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

Clarence W. Wille, of Pennsylvania, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

Dunlop Moore, of Pennsylvania, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

Carroll Fox, of Pennsylvania, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

Joseph Goldberger, of Pennsylvania, to be an assistant surgeon in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Third Lieut. William E. AtLee, of New York, to be a second lieutenant in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

First Asst. Engineer Denis F. Bowen, of New York, to be a chief engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

Second Lieut. Llewellyn W. Oliver, from the infantry arm to the cavalry arm, January 3, 1900, with rank from February 16, 1899.

CAVALRY ARM.

E. Holland Rubottom, of California, to be second lieutenant, June 1, 1899.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

TO BE SURGEON WITH THE RANK OF MAJOR.

Frank H. Titus, of California, acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, January 4, 1900.

TO BE ADDITIONAL PAYMASTERS WITH THE RANK OF MAJOR.

Charles Newbold, of the District of Columbia, March 11, 1899.

Bradner D. Slaughter, of Nebraska, March 11, 1899.

PROMOTIONS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

FORTY-FOURTH INFANTRY.

Second Lieut. Benjamin R. Hall, Forty-fourth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, November 29, 1899.

Second Lieut. Howard M. Koontz, Forty-fourth Infantry, to be first lieutenant, November 30, 1899.

TO BE DEPUTY PAYMASTERS-GENERAL WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT-COLONEL.

Maj. Culver C. Sniffen, paymaster, March 31, 1899.

Maj. George W. Baird, paymaster, July 12, 1899.

PAY DEPARTMENT.

To be paymasters with the rank of major.

Webster Vinson, of Virginia, April 3, 1899.

Capt. John Murphy (since retired from active service), Fourteenth Infantry, July 12, 1899.

Charles Newbold, of District of Columbia, July 22, 1899.

Hamilton S. Wallace, of District of Columbia, September 9, 1899.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

W. Frank Kinney, of Connecticut, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Connecticut.

GENERAL APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Israel F. Fischer, of New York, to be general appraiser of merchandise.

APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Henry S. Hill, of New York, to be appraiser of merchandise in the district of Buffalo Creek, in the State of New York.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Charles J. Greene, of Ruston, La., who was appointed April 1, 1899, during the recess of the Senate, to be receiver of public moneys at Natchitoches, La.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Horace Speed, of Oklahoma Territory, to be attorney of the United States for the Territory of Oklahoma.

MARSHAL.

Frank Simmons, of Alabama, to be marshal of the United States for the southern district of Alabama.

INDIAN AGENT.

Andrew F. Caldwell, of Pocatello, Idaho, to be agent for the Indians of the Fort Hall Agency, in Idaho.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

Louis J. Winston, of Mississippi, to be collector of customs for the district of Natchez, in the State of Mississippi.

Walter C. Witherbee, of New York, to be collector of customs for the district of Champlain, in the State of New York.

Henry Harrison, of New York, to be collector of customs for the district of Genesee, in the State of New York.

John Bourne, of New York, to be collector of customs for the district of Dunkirk, in the State of New York.

POSTMASTERS.

Albert T. Williams, to be postmaster at Port Tampa City, in the county of Hillsboro and State of Florida.

George B. Patterson, to be postmaster at Key West, in the county of Monroe and State of Florida.

William A. Murat, to be postmaster at Apalachicola, in the county of Franklin and State of Florida.

Henry C. Groves, to be postmaster at Ocala, in the county of Marion and State of Florida.

Ellen S. Griffin, to be postmaster at Franklin, in the county of Merrimack and State of New Hampshire.

George Glass, to be postmaster at High Springs, in the county of Alachua and State of Florida.

Alexander Zipperer, to be postmaster at Madison, in the county of Madison and State of Florida.

Harry L. Cooper, to be postmaster at Edinboro, in the county of Erie and State of Pennsylvania.

David E. Ward, to be postmaster at Dell Rapids, in the county of Minnehaha and State of South Dakota.

Fred S. Huckins, to be postmaster at Ashland, in the county of Grafton and State of New Hampshire.

George A. McIntire, to be postmaster at Milford, in the county of Hillsboro and State of New Hampshire.

Charles E. Buzzell, to be postmaster at Lakeport, in the county of Belknap and State of New Hampshire.

Charles Graffin, to be postmaster at Catasauqua, in the county of Lehigh and State of Pennsylvania.

William Kelly, to be postmaster at Lockhart, in the county of Caldwell and State of Texas.

Frank L. Bradley, to be postmaster at Gilmer, in the county of Upshur and State of Texas.

Charles A. Edwards, to be postmaster at Prattville, in the county of Autauga and State of Alabama.

Thomas F. Griswold, to be postmaster at Covina, in the county of Los Angeles and State of California.

George F. Beales, to be postmaster at Visalia, in the county of Tulare and State of California.

Lorena Hays, to be postmaster at Cullman, in the county of Cullman and State of Alabama.

Augustus G. Ising, to be postmaster at Danbury, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut.

John W. Wood, to be postmaster at Pasadena, in the county of Los Angeles and State of California.

John W. Loyd, to be postmaster at Portersville, in the county of Tulare and State of California.

Henry L. Kramer, to be postmaster at Indiana Mineral Springs, in the county of Warren and State of Indiana.

Jesse S. Birch, to be postmaster at Oxford, in the county of Benton and State of Indiana.

William H. Kenyon, to be postmaster at Moosup, in the county of Windham and State of Connecticut.

F. A. Christensen, to be postmaster at Lake Mills, in the county of Winnebago and State of Iowa.

Lars E. Bladine, to be postmaster at Marathon, in the county of Buena Vista and State of Iowa.

Frank M. Pickerl, to be postmaster at Argos, in the county of Marshall and State of Indiana.

Charles L. Hartinger, to be postmaster at Alden, in the county of Hardin and State of Iowa.

Wellington H. Gowdy, to be postmaster at Corwith, in the county of Hancock and State of Iowa.

George S. Crandall, to be postmaster at Schaller, in the county of Sac and State of Iowa.

Gilbert Knudson, to be postmaster at Jewell, in the county of Hamilton and State of Iowa.

B. F. Keables, to be postmaster at Pella, in the county of Marion and State of Iowa.

William David Junkin, to be postmaster at Rock Rapids, in the county of Lyon and State of Iowa.

William L. McWilliams, to be postmaster at Miami, in the Ottawa Nation, of Indian Territory.

Caleb H. Wickersham, to be postmaster at West Branch, in the county of Cedar and State of Iowa.

William C. Marsh, to be postmaster at Aurelia, in the county of Cherokee and State of Iowa.

Charles F. Reed, to be postmaster at Whitman, in the county of Plymouth and State of Massachusetts.

Charles F. Hammond, to be postmaster at Nantucket, in the county of Nantucket and State of Massachusetts.

Henry S. Mueller, to be postmaster at Sedgwick, in the county of Harvey and State of Kansas.

Jonathan F. Jefferds, to be postmaster at Livermore Falls, in the county of Androscoggin and State of Maine.

Eldridge H. Bryant, to be postmaster at Machias, in the county of Washington and State of Maine.

Samuel Hambleton, to be postmaster at Rising Sun, in the county of Cecil and State of Maryland.

Bangs F. Warner, to be postmaster at Paw Paw, in the county of Van Buren and State of Michigan.

George Preston, to be postmaster at Grass Lake, in the county of Jackson and State of Michigan.

John M. Thurlough, to be postmaster at Fort Fairfield, in the county of Aroostook and State of Maine.

Fred N. Corey, to be postmaster at Elk River, in the county of Sherburne and State of Minnesota.

John Y. Breckenridge, to be postmaster at Pine City, in the county of Pine and State of Minnesota.

Harlow D. Wells, to be postmaster at Ypsilanti, in the county of Washtenaw and State of Michigan.

Isaac H. Lutterloh, to be postmaster at Sanford, in the county of Moore and State of North Carolina.

Hakon E. Glasoe, to be postmaster at Lanesboro, in the county of Fillmore and State of Minnesota.

Ole C. Enge, to be postmaster at Elmore, in the county of Fari-bault and State of Minnesota.

Charles C. Jessup, to be postmaster at Woodbury, in the county of Gloucester and State of New Jersey.

Thomas W. Collier, to be postmaster at Raton, in the county of Colfax and Territory of New Mexico.

Joseph Powles, to be postmaster at Milton, in the county of Cavalier and State of North Dakota.

Patrick W. Carr, to be postmaster at Flandreau, in the county of Moody and State of South Dakota.

George F. Merriman, to be postmaster at Medford, in the county of Jackson and State of Oregon.

John Heald, to be postmaster at Wappingers Falls, in the county of Dutchess and State of New York.

Edward B. Bennett, to be postmaster at Hartford, in the county of Hartford and State of Connecticut.

Theodore Riel, to be postmaster at Burlington, in the county of Racine and State of Wisconsin.

Robert Murdock, to be postmaster at Logan, in the county of Cache and State of Utah.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, January 17, 1900.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read, corrected, and approved.

HOURS OF POLICEMEN, FIREMEN, AND OFFICERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations to report back the bill (H. R. 3343) to regulate the service and fix the hours of service for persons employed as policemen, firemen, and officers in the District of Columbia, and to ask that it be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Vermont, under instructions of his committee, reports back the bill H. R. 3343 and asks that it shall be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. Without objection, that order will be made.

There was no objection.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations to report the bill (H. R. 6627) making appropriations for invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin presents the following privileged report from the Committee on Appropriations:

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6627) making appropriations for invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and printed.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I desire to reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman reserves all points of order on the bill.

Mr. BARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I will give notice later at what time I will call up the bill for consideration.

TWELFTH CENSUS.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned last night we were considering an appeal which had been taken by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] from the ruling of the Speaker on the bill that was presented as a privileged bill from the Committee on the Twelfth Census. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RUSSELL], when I presented the bill yesterday as a privileged bill, raised the point against it that there was no provision in the rules of the House that made it a privileged matter, and contended that in view of that it must go upon the Calendar, the same as bills from other committees that are not privileged under the rules. The Speaker held it was a privileged bill, because it is carrying out a duty imposed on Congress by the Constitution, and hence, regardless of the question as to whether the rules specifically provided that it shall be privileged, that it is a matter of the highest privilege under the Constitution.

The gentleman from Connecticut, and in that position he was seconded by my honored friend from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON], took the position that the rules must govern, and insisted that inasmuch as there was no specific rule that covers the case, the bill presented by the Committee on the Census therefore was not privileged. The Speaker, in making his decision yesterday, called the attention of the House to a ruling of Speaker Reed in the Fifty-first Congress, when Mr. Dunnell, of Minnesota, the then chairman of the Committee on the Census, presented a bill for apportionment, and it was contended then, as it is now, that that committee was not a privileged committee, and the bill itself was not a privileged bill; and Speaker Reed held in that instance it was privileged, and the House acquiesced in the ruling of the Speaker; and the present occupant of the chair, in rendering his decision, followed the precedent that was there established. Since the adjournment of the House my attention has been called to two other decisions of this House that cover this point, namely, that any matter that under the Constitution is a matter of high privilege can be brought into the House and considered regardless of the question whether the rules of the House make the proposition itself a privileged matter.

I desire, Mr. Speaker, to call to the attention of the members of the House the decision that was rendered by Mr. Speaker Randall in 1877:

On February 12, 1877, Mr. David Dudley Field, of New York, from the Committee on the Privileges, Powers, and Duties of the House of Representatives in Counting the Vote for President and Vice-President of the United States, reported a bill (H. R. 4693) to amend the Revised Statutes of the United States in respect to vacancies in the offices of President and Vice-President, and demanded the previous question thereon.

Mr. Horatio C. Burchard, of Illinois, made the point of order that the committee had no authority to report the said bill.

The Speaker overruled the point of order, on the ground that the resolution creating the said committee authorized it "to ascertain and report what are the privileges, powers, and duties of the House of Representatives in counting the votes for President and Vice-President of the United States," and also gave the committee the right to report at any time. The Speaker further stated that he could not conceive of a question of higher constitutional and parliamentary privilege than was involved in the bill under consideration, and he therefore held the bill to be in order at this time.

Mr. RICHARDSON. What section is that?

Mr. HOPKINS. I am reading from page 90 of the Compilation, section 143;

On January 10, 1843, Mr. John M. Botts, of Virginia, as a privileged subject, submitted the following:

"I do impeach John Tyler, Vice-President, acting as President of the United States, of the following high crimes and misdemeanors."

Then he cites the charges that he made.

Mr. Everett, of Vermont, submitted that the proposition of Mr. Botts could not take precedence on the ground of privilege, and therefore was not in order according to the routine of business as established by the rule. The Speaker decided that as by the Constitution it was a privilege of the House of Representatives to institute proceedings against the President, he considered that the present was a privileged proceeding and took precedence of other proceedings.

These two cases, in addition to the decision cited by the Speaker last night, namely, the decision of Speaker Reed in the Fifty-first Congress, in my judgment, establish beyond peradventure that it is not necessary, where the question is a constitutional question, that there should be a specific rule of the House to determine the privileged character of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Will my colleague yield a moment to call attention to one other noted ruling? In 1875 or 1876—when Mr. Randall was Speaker of the House—the House was engaged in canvassing the vote of electors for the Presidency, and pending the coming together of the House and the Senate, under the lead, as I recollect, of my distinguished colleague, Mr. Springer, and others upon that side of the House, dilatory motions, which had always been held in order, were being made. It was one of the most memorable scenes I ever witnessed in this House. A point of order was made that they were not in order because the House

was engaged in the performance of a duty directed by the Constitution. The gavel of Speaker Randall came down, and he sustained the point of order and disregarded the then rule of the House because the Constitution called for the performance of the duty.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, Article I, section 2, of the Constitution of the United States requires that Congress shall, every ten years, make an enumeration of the people of the United States as shall be directed by law. In the Fifty-first Congress a bill was prepared by the Census Committee and presented to the House, organizing the machinery for the purpose of taking this enumeration.

Now, I think, Mr. Speaker, that the position taken by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY], who so ably argued this position yesterday afternoon, is in entire harmony with the position of the Speaker when the bill is taken into consideration. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] stated in his remarks in opposition to the ruling of the Speaker as follows:

If there were an enumeration of the people for the purpose of apportioning the Representatives, the bill would be privileged.

Clearly showing that he recognizes the force and effect of the decision to which I have already adverted and the ruling of Speaker Reed in the Fifty-first Congress. Now, that brings us squarely to the question as to what is an enumeration. Is it simply a count of the people? Not at all. The Constitution says we must make an enumeration as provided by law. How do we do that? We do it by establishing a Census Bureau, by creating a Director of the Census, an assistant director, and a number of statisticians, a large clerical force, for the purpose of tabulating the facts collected. We create the offices of supervisor and enumerators and special agents and all this great force for what purpose? For the specific purpose of carrying out these provisions of the Constitution to which I have just referred.

Now, what is the other part of it? Why, Mr. Speaker, the printing of the tabulated facts collected for the benefit of Congress is just as much a part of the enumeration as it is to appoint a supervisor. The enumerators go out and gather the facts; but how can the enumerators act without having the printing done?

They take the instructions given to them prepared by the Director and his able corps of assistants. It requires tons of printing to do that, so that the clause in the law which relates to printing clearly comes within the provision of the Constitution just referred to. If I understood the gentleman from Texas correctly yesterday, he concedes that the bill that was presented in the Fifty-fifth Congress is in strict accordance with the Constitution and was a privileged matter. I now desire to have the Clerk read from the desk the bill that is proposed by the committee at this time, to show to the members of the House that it is in strict accordance with the provisions of the original bill; that it is simply to amend certain deficiencies that are found to exist in that law.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 2179) relating to the Twelfth and subsequent censuses, and giving to the Director thereof additional power and authority in certain cases, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in addition to the power and authority conferred upon the Director of the Census by an act entitled "An act to provide for taking the Twelfth and subsequent censuses," approved March 3, 1899, said Director of the Census shall have power, and is hereby authorized, to appoint and employ, as the necessity therefor may arise, one purchasing agent, at an annual salary of \$2,500; two chiefs of division, at an annual salary of \$2,000 each; five clerks of class 4; six clerks of class 3, and eight clerks of class 2; to employ such number of special agents, not exceeding 35 in all, as may be proper and necessary for the purpose of gathering any information or data in relation to or required by the agricultural schedules; to employ special agents to assist the supervisors in large cities whenever he may deem it proper, in connection with the work of preparation for, or during the progress of, the enumeration, or in connection with the reenumeration of any district, or a part thereof; to employ as special agents such of the supervisors of census as he may deem wise and proper, at the compensation provided for in section 17 of said act, the intent and purpose being that the supervisors of census may be appointed special agents at the time they are acting as supervisors, and receive the compensation to which they are entitled as supervisors and also as special agents. And the Director of the Census is authorized and directed to collect statistics relating to all of the deaf, dumb, and blind, notwithstanding the restrictions and limitations contained in section 8 of said act entitled "An act to provide for taking the Twelfth and subsequent censuses;" and the Director of the Census is hereby specifically authorized to pay such supervisors for their services as special agents the compensation which he may authorize out of any general or special appropriation which may be made for the payment of special agents, and to allow any supervisor of census, in addition to the contingencies provided for in section 11 of said act, actual and necessary traveling expenses and an allowance in lieu of subsistence not exceeding \$3 per day during his necessary absence from his usual place of residence in connection with the work of preparation for the enumeration; to allow, in fixing the compensation of enumerators, not more than 5 cents for each death reported, to purchase any and all law books, books of reference, or periodicals which may be required from time to time in the Census Office, and pay for the same out of the sum appropriated by the said act of March 3, 1899, or any other appropriation hereafter made for the census work, whether there be a specific authorization for such purchases or not: *Provided,* That the aggregate amount of such purchases shall not exceed the sum of \$2,000.

SEC. 2. That in addition to the other statistics required to be collected by section 7 of said act approved March 3, 1899, there shall be collected on the agricultural schedules information concerning the number and kinds of live stock not on farms; and the Director of the Census shall have power to pay

the enumerators for collecting such information, in his discretion, not less than 5 nor more than 10 cents for each barn or inclosure visited in which such live stock may be found: *Provided, however,* That the Director of the Census may appoint special agents to gather the information required by this section whenever he may deem it proper.

SEC. 3. That in the event of the death of any supervisor or enumerator after his appointment and entrance on his duties, the Director of the Census be, and he is, authorized to pay to his widow, if there be one, and if not to his legal representative, such sum as may be just and fair for the services rendered by said supervisor or enumerator prior to his death.

SEC. 4. That the Director of the Census, whenever he shall find that there is a probability of delay in the printing or publishing of the census reports beyond the period required by the said act of March 3, 1899, be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to contract with any individual, copartnership, or corporation for the printing and binding, or either, of any of said reports, in the manner prescribed by law for the letting of public contracts.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, if the members of the House followed carefully the reading of the bill they will see that its sole and only object is to carry out this provision of the Constitution which imposes the duty upon this House and the Senate to provide the machinery for enumerating the people of this country, in order that an apportionment may be made as contemplated in the Constitution itself.

The first portion of the bill relates to increasing the power and efficiency of the clerical force in the office of the Director of the Census. The second relates to the appointment of special agents to aid the supervisors in laying out the enumeration districts, so that the enumeration may be made more efficiently and accurately than could be done under the original bill.

The third section relates to an increased power in taking the census of mutes, blind people, and other unfortunates.

I apprehend, Mr. Speaker, had it not been for the adoption of section 4 in the amended bill, which relates to printing, this question that is now before the House would not have been raised at all. I desire, however, to say to gentlemen upon both sides of the Chamber that in sustaining the Speaker it commits no man to that section of the proposed bill. When that bill is considered upon its merits, those who stand with the majority of the committee can vote to sustain that section. Those who are opposed to it can vote against it, and whatever the action may be in that regard, it will be the action of the House and we must bow to the mandate of the House. But so far as this appeal is concerned, and the question that is now pending, it is as much a part of the enumeration as any branch of the bill that is already the law of the land, or as any part of the bill which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] concede to be germane to the original bill and to be privileged matter.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, with the explanation I have made here today, there will be no hesitancy and no doubt among my Republican colleagues as to the correctness of the ruling of the Speaker. I trust that my Democratic friends on the other side of the Chamber will feel that the decision of Speaker Reed and the decision of Speaker Randall are in harmony with the decision made by the present Speaker, and that the motion which I now make, Mr. Speaker, to lay this appeal on the table will be approved by the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I hope the gentleman will not make that motion until I have an opportunity to be heard.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] moves to lay the appeal on the table.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I appeal to the gentleman that it is not fair to move to lay the appeal on the table after making a long speech himself.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] both discussed this matter at length yesterday.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes; but you have presented new matter—

Mr. HOPKINS. I must insist on my motion.

Mr. RICHARDSON. You have presented new matter, and I submit that the motion to lay an appeal on the table is never made by a gentleman at the conclusion of a long speech in which he has presented new matter. Now, I want to comment upon that briefly—

Mr. HOPKINS. I insist upon my motion.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I want to comment upon the new authorities to which you have referred, and to show that they do not apply. I appeal to the gentleman's sense of fairness—

Mr. HOPKINS. There has been more discussion on that side of the House than on this, and I must insist upon my motion.

Mr. GAINES. The bill was not read until this morning.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois insists upon his motion.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have never known a motion of that kind to be made when new matter has been introduced. I have never known that to be done in all my experience here.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee will please suspend. The gentleman from Illinois insists upon his motion, and it becomes the duty of the Chair to submit it. The gentleman from Illinois moves to lay the pending appeal upon the table.

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that he was in doubt.

Mr. MERCER. The yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Those in favor of laying the appeal on the table will, as their names are called, vote aye; those opposed, no; and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 165, nays 138, answered "present" 2, not voting 49; as follows:

YEAS—165.

Acheson,	Dolliver,	Kerr,	Ray,
Alexander,	Dovenor,	Ketcham,	Reeder,
Allen, Me.	Driscoll,	Knox,	Reeves,
Babeock,	Eddy,	Lacey,	Roberts, Mass.
Bailey, Kans.	Emerson,	Landis,	Rodenberg,
Baker,	Esch,	Lane,	Russell,
Barham,	Faris,	Linney,	Shattuc,
Barney,	Fletcher,	Littaner,	Shelden,
Bartholdt,	Fordney,	Littlefield,	Showalter,
Bingham,	Foss,	Long,	Small,
Bishop,	Fowler,	Lorimer,	Smith, Ill.
Boring,	Freer,	Loud,	Smith, H. C.
Boutell, Ill.	Gamble,	Loudenslager,	Smith, Samuel W.
Bowersock,	Gardner, Mich.	Loving,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Brick,	Gardner, N. J.	Lybrand,	Southard,
Bromwell,	Gibson,	McCleary,	Sperry,
Brosius,	Gill,	McPherson,	Sprague,
Brownlow,	Gillet, N. Y.	Marsh,	Steele,
Bull,	Graff,	Mercer,	Stevens, Minn.
Burke, S. Dak.	Graham,	Mesick,	Stewart, N. J.
Burkett,	Grosvenor,	Metcalf,	Stewart, N. Y.
Burleigh,	Grout,	Miller,	Stewart, Wis.
Burton,	Grown,	Minor,	Sulloway,
Butler,	Hamilton,	Mondell,	Taylor, Ohio
Calderhead,	Haugen,	Moody, Mass.	Thomas, Iowa
Cannon,	Hawley,	Moody, Oreg.	Thropp,
Capron,	Heatwole,	Morgan,	Tompkins,
Clarke, N. H.	Hedge,	Morris,	Tongue,
Cochrane, N. Y.	Hemenway,	Mudd,	Van Voorhis,
Connell,	Henry, Conn.	Needham,	Vreeland,
Cooper, Wis.	Hepburn,	O'Grady,	Wadsworth,
Corliss,	Hill,	Olmsted,	Wanger,
Cromer,	Hitt,	Otjen,	Warner,
Crump,	Hoffecker,	Overstreet,	Waters,
Crumpacker,	Hopkins,	Parker, N. J.	Watson,
Curtis,	Howell,	Payne,	Weaver,
Dahle, Wis.	Hull,	Pearce, Mo.	Weeks,
Dalzell,	Jack,	Pearre,	White,
Davenport, S. A.	Jenkins,	Phillips,	Wright,
Davidson,	Jones, Wash.	Powers,	
Dayton,	Joy,	Prince,	
Dick,	Kahn,	Pugh,	

NAYS—138.

Adamson,	Davey,	Levy,	Ruppert,
Allen, Ky.	Davis,	Lewis,	Ryan, N. Y.
Allen, Miss.	De Armond,	Little,	Ryan, Pa.
Atwater,	De Vries,	Livingston,	Salmon,
Bailey, Tex.	Denny,	Lloyd,	Scudder,
Ball,	Dinsmore,	McClellan,	Shackleford,
Bankhead,	Dougherty,	McCulloch,	Sheppard,
Barber,	Elliott,	McDowell,	Sibley,
Bartlett,	Epes,	McLain,	Sims,
Bell,	Finley,	McRae,	Slayden,
Bellamy,	Fitzgerald, Mass.	Maddox,	Smith, Ky.
Benton,	Fitzpatrick,	May,	Snodgrass,
Berry,	Foster,	Meekison,	Sparkman,
Brantley,	Fox,	Meyer, La.	Stevens, Tex.
Brezzeale,	Gaines,	Miers, Ind.	Stokes,
Brenner,	Gaston,	Moon,	Sulzer,
Brewer,	Gayle,	Muller,	Sutherland,
Broussard,	Glynn,	Napfen,	Swanson,
Brundidge,	Gordon,	Neville,	Talbert,
Burke, Tex.	Griffith,	Norton, Ohio	Taylor, Ala.
Burleson,	Griggs,	Norton, S. C.	Thayer,
Caldwell,	Hall,	Pierce, Tenn.	Thomas, N. C.
Campbell,	Hay,	Quarles,	Turner,
Catchings,	Henry, Miss.	Ransdell,	Underwood,
Clark, Mo.	Henry, Tex.	Rhea, Ky.	Wheeler, Ky.
Clayton, Ala.	Howard,	Rhea, Va.	Williams, J. R.
Clayton, N. Y.	Johnston,	Richardson,	Williams, W. E.
Cochran, Mo.	Jones, Va.	Ridgely,	Williams, Miss.
Cooper, Tex.	Kitchin,	Riordon,	Wilson, Idaho
Cowherd,	Kleberg,	Rixey,	Wilson, N. Y.
Cox,	Kluttz,	Robbins,	Wilson, S. C.
Crawford,	Lamb,	Robertson, La.	Zenor,
Cummings,	Lanham,	Robinson, Ind.	Ziegler,
Daly, N. J.	Latimer,	Robinson, Nebr.	
Davenport, S. W.	Lester,	Rucker,	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Driggs, Packer, Pa.

NOT VOTING—49.

Adams,	De Graffenreid.	Mahon,	Tate,
Boutelle, Me.	Fitzgerald, N. Y.	Mann,	Tawney,
Bradley,	Fleming,	Newlands,	Terry,
Brown,	Gilbert,	Noonan,	Underhill,
Burnett,	Gillett, Mass.	Otey,	Vandiver,
Carmack,	Green, Pa.	Polk,	Wachter,
Chanler,	Greene, Mass.	Robb,	Weymouth,
Chickering,	Harmer,	Shafroth,	Wheeler, Ala.
Cooney,	Jett,	Sherman,	Young, Pa.
Cousins,	Lawrence,	Spalding,	Young, Va.
Crowley,	Lentz,	Spight,	
Cusack,	McAleer,	Stallings,	
Cushman,	McCall,	Stark,	

So the motion to lay the appeal on the table was agreed to.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. LANDIS with Mr. BURNETT.

Mr. MAHON with Mr. OTEY.

Mr. SHERMAN with Mr. DRIGGS.

Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania with Mr. BRADLEY.

Mr. MANN with Mr. JETT.

Mr. MCCALL with Mr. JONES of Virginia.

Mr. PACKER of Pennsylvania with Mr. POLK, during the session.

For this day:

Mr. LAWRENCE with Mr. GILBERT.

Mr. WACHTER with Mr. UNDERHILL.

Mr. BOREING with Mr. SPIGHT.

Mr. BAKER with Mr. CROWLEY.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts with Mr. CARMACK.

Mr. CHICKERING with Mr. STARK.

Mr. WEYMOUTH with Mr. DE GRAFFENREID.

Mr. HARMER with Mr. VANDIVER.

Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine with Mr. NOONAN.

Mr. TAWNEY with Mr. ROBB.

Mr. SPALDING with Mr. FITZGERALD of New York.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts with Mr. LENTZ.

Mr. CUSHMAN with Mr. TERRY.

Mr. COUSINS with Mr. FLEMING.

Mr. BROWN with Mr. CHANLER.

Mr. ADAMS with Mr. MCALEER.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, did I understand the Clerk to read that I was paired with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY]? I would like to know how the gentleman voted.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa is paired, but the gentleman from Virginia voted.

Mr. HULL. Then I want my vote to stand.

Mr. PACKER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. POLK]. I desire to withdraw my vote, and to be recorded "present."

Mr. ADAMS. Did the Clerk announce my name as paired?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not recorded.

Mr. ADAMS. I am paired with my colleague [Mr. MCALEER].

The SPEAKER. Neither voted.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to inquire whether Mr. RYAN voted?

The SPEAKER. Both Mr. RYANS voted.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. HOPKINS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the appeal was laid on the table was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and resolution of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 2284. An act extending the time for the completion of a wagon and motor bridge across the Missouri River at St. Charles, Mo., as provided by an act approved June 3, 1896;

S. 2336. An act repealing section 4716 of the Revised Statutes so far as the same may be applicable to the claims of dependent parents of soldiers, sailors, and marines who served in the Army or Navy of the United States during the war with Spain; and

Senate concurrent resolution No. 9:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 3,000 additional copies of Senate Miscellaneous Document 278, second session Fifty-third Congress, the same being a "Digest of decisions and precedents of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, relating to their powers and privileges respecting their members and officers, and to investigations, contempts, libels, contumacious witnesses, expulsions, etc.," as revised and new matter added, together with decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and other courts, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

SENATE BILL AND RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a Senate bill and resolution of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 2336. An act repealing section 4716 of the Revised Statutes so far as the same may be applicable to the claims of dependent parents of soldiers, sailors, and marines who served in the Army or Navy of the United States during the war with Spain—to the Committee on Pensions.

Senate concurrent resolution No. 9:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 3,000 additional copies of Senate Miscellaneous Document 278, second session Fifty-third Congress, the same being a "Digest of Decisions and precedents of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, relating to their powers and privileges respecting their members and officers, and to investigations, contumacious witnesses, expulsions, etc.," as revised and new matter added, together with decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and other courts, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 2,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives—

to the Committee on Printing.

URGENT DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the urgent deficiency bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. DALZELL in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House bill 6237. By order of the House general debate was closed at 5 o'clock last evening. The Clerk will report the bill by paragraphs.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums be, and the same are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year 1900, and for prior years, and for other objects hereinafter stated, namely:

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I avail myself of this opportunity to say a few words in regard to a resolution I introduced on the 12th day of this month for the appointment of a special committee of nine to make a rigid and thorough investigation of the transactions of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Treasury Department with the Standard Oil Trust bank, namely, the National City Bank, and the Hanover National Bank, of New York, and other national banks, from the 4th day of March, 1897, down to the present time.

Thus far I am informed no action has been taken by the partisan Committee on Rules in regard to that resolution. If I am reliably informed, from what I read in the newspapers I understand MARK HANNA, the great boss of the Republican party, has said this investigation of the charges against the Secretary of the Treasury is "all rot;" and that the President—the mere agent of the money trust—has given orders to suppress the investigation; and that the Republicans in this House intend to do nothing further in regard to these grave and serious charges, involving, as they do, the Administration with the Standard Oil Trust and its agents.

If that is so we want to know it, and we ought to know it. If you intend to smother this investigation, say so honestly and let the people know it. If you do not intend to take cognizance of these scandalous charges against the Secretary of the Treasury and his administration of the Treasury Department, we on this side of the House want to know it and ought to know it. And if you say that you intend to suppress all further investigation in regard to this matter we will see what we can do about it.

If you suppress that resolution for a thorough and rigid investigation I believe you will regret it. I know you have the physical power and the votes in this House to suppress this investigation; but if you do there is another remedy we can pursue, and for one I unhesitatingly say that you shall not escape responsibility and that, if necessary, the severer remedy will be resorted to.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask for order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend for a moment, and the committee will be in order. Gentlemen will please be seated.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I now desire to read the resolution for an investigation introduced by me on the 12th day of January, 1900. It is as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee, consisting of nine members of the House of Representatives, be immediately appointed by the Speaker to make a thorough and complete investigation of all dealings and transactions between the Secretary of the Treasury or the Treasury Department of the United States and the National City Bank and the Hanover National Bank, of the city of New York, or any other national bank of the United States, from the 4th day of March, 1897, to the present time, and especially in regard to all letters, agreements, papers, or documents between the Treasury Department of the United States, or any person connected therewith, and the National City Bank and the Hanover National Bank, of the city of New York, or any person acting for them, or either of them, since the 4th day of March, 1897, relating to the depositing of public funds, bonds, or revenues in said bank or banks or any other relations or business transactions now existing or heretofore had between the Government and the said banks, or either of them, and the amount of public money, bonds, or revenue deposited with said banks, or either of them, or with any national bank, by the Government, upon what security, for what length of time, and the reasons therefor, and whether said banks, or any of them, have paid the Government any interest on said deposits, and if so, how much, and all other information concerning the same or in any way relating thereto; and also the date of the sale of the custom-house property of the United States in New York City to said National City Bank, the date of the execution of the deed thereto, the date and manner of payment of the purchase money therefor, the disposition of the proceeds of said sale, and whether or not the Government has paid any rents for said property, or any portion thereof, for any purpose since the day of sale, and if so, to whom, and all facts relating to said transaction, and all other matters in connection therewith or in any way relating thereto; and said committee is authorized to send for persons, books, letters, telegrams, papers, documents, and agreements, administer oaths, and hold open sessions, and sit at any time in any place in the city of Washington, New York, or Chicago, the expense for the same to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, and the Sergeant-at-Arms, or some one acting for him, shall attend said committee and carry out its mandates; and said committee is instructed to make a report to the House of Representatives, with testimony and exhibits, with all convenient speed.

This resolution speaks for itself, and expresses the scope of the

investigation we demand. We insist that you take action in regard to it in the interest of truth and publicity.

Mr. Chairman, let me say here that I disclaim any personal animosity toward the Secretary of the Treasury, or any desire to seek partisan advantage or to make political capital for myself or my party out of this investigation. I believe, however, that the action of the Secretary of the Treasury is subject to severe criticism and open to grave public censure and condemnation. The charges against the Secretary of the Treasury can not be hushed up and they will not down. Make no mistake about that.

The Treasury Department, it seems, is no longer the safe of the Republic. It is a mere agency of the national banks, and responsive to their will and pliable to their manipulations. It seems that the Standard Oil trust owns, controls, and dominates this Administration. Read the answer of the Secretary of the Treasury to the resolution of inquiry of this House and no fair-minded man can doubt it for a moment.

We want the facts; we want to get at the truth; we want to unearth all the transactions between the Treasury Department and the Standard Oil trust. We want a searching, rigid, and thorough investigation; and if we get it, we believe that the facts will show a much worse condition of public affairs in the Treasury Department than anyone imagines.

Mr. Chairman, the charge is made and not denied that the Secretary of the Treasury has violated the law knowingly and intentionally to carry out apparently an infamous political bargain.

The charge is made and not denied that the Secretary of the Treasury has practically turned the Treasury funds of the Government over to the Standard Oil trust and its bank, the most gigantic and cold-blooded monopoly the world has ever seen, and has permitted it and its agents to rob and swindle the people. You can not cover up this scandal.

In the first place, the charge is made by reputable newspapers and by reputable citizens that the Secretary of the Treasury clearly and distinctly violated the law in regard to the sale of the custom-house in the city of New York and in regard to the disposition of the proceeds of that sale. On the 2d day of March, 1899, this House passed an act for the sale of the custom-house property in the city of New York.

By section 4 of that act it was specifically enjoined on the Secretary of the Treasury that the proceeds of the sale should be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. That is the law, and the fact is, according to the admission of the Secretary himself, that he deliberately violated the law by leaving the proceeds of the sale in the Standard Oil national bank. Let us look at the matter for just a moment. The Secretary sold the custom-house property in New York City to the National City Bank, owned and controlled by the Standard Oil people. The sale was made on the 3d day of last July, and not one dollar of the money has ever found its way into the Treasury, but has remained all the time in the National City Bank.

This was a clear violation of the law, and if I can read the statute right it makes the Secretary of the Treasury guilty of embezzlement. Section 5490 of the Revised Statutes plainly says that every officer charged by an act of Congress with the performance of a duty who does what the Secretary of the Treasury did in this instance is guilty of embezzlement. That is the law, and the facts applicable to it are conceded. There can be no question about the liability of the Secretary.

Now, I say that you can not afford to ignore this grave and serious matter; you can not afford to suppress this investigation, and if you do the responsibility will be on you, and you will hear more about it before many weeks come and go. This scandal must be probed to the bottom, in the interest of truth and publicity, and I undertake to say that the more you try to cover it up, the more you will hear about it between now and the next election.

Section 4 of the act of March 2, 1899, being the act for the sale of the custom-house in New York City, says:

That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to deposit the proceeds of the sale, after the payment of the usual incidental expenses, in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

And section 5490 of the Revised Statutes of the United States says:

Every officer or other person charged by any act of Congress with the safe-keeping of public money who fails to fully keep the same without loaning, using, or converting the same to his own use, or depositing in bank, is guilty of embezzlement.

The facts of the case are clear and admitted. The law speaks for itself, and is capable of only one construction.

If the Secretary of the Treasury is innocent, he should welcome and demand an investigation to clear himself. If he is guilty, he should be impeached and removed from office. The more you try to cover up this matter the worse it will be.

That, sir, is the law and the duty enjoined on the Secretary of the Treasury; and to-day, according to his own answer to the resolution of inquiry of this House, he admits that he has violated

that law. He did not deposit the proceeds of that sale in the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts. Let us see what he did. On the 3d of last July he sold the custom-house property. He sold it to the bank of the Standard Oil trust—the National City Bank—and instead of depositing the money in the Treasury he left it in the bank. Not one dollar ever passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SULZER. I ask that I may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks for five minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, while I do not think the gentleman's remarks are upon the bill, yet I hope the five minutes will be given to him.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SULZER. I thank the gentleman from Illinois, but let me say to him that if his party does not probe to the bottom this great national scandal involving the Administration with the Standard Oil trust—the greatest monopoly in all the world—he will hear a good deal more about it on the stump between now and election day. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

As I was saying, Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of the Treasury did not deposit one dollar of the proceeds of the sale in the Treasury of the United States. On the contrary, he left every dollar of the purchase price of this property with the purchaser, the National City Bank—that is to say, the Standard Oil bank—and it has been there from the day of its purchase down to the present time. Under the law of this country, in my judgment and in the judgment of other good and sound lawyers, this failure on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury to obey the statute, his failure to deposit the money in the Treasury Department, constitutes embezzlement.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the country very briefly to a speech made by William McKinley, member of Congress from the State of Ohio, on the floor of this House on February 29, 1888. At that time he was charging a Democratic Secretary of the Treasury with political favoritism in depositing Government funds in pet national banks. The amount on deposit at that time with national banks was about \$59,000,000, and this is what Mr. McKinley said:

That surplus money ought to be in the Treasury to-day. It is now out among the banks and held by them, they giving to the Government bonds as security for the deposit and are getting the money without interest. I charge the President of the United States and his Administration with being responsible for this condition of affairs and for whatever congested condition we have in the Treasury and whatever alarm prevails about the finances of the country. Every dollar of this money should be paid to redeem the Government debt.

What a difference between now and then! What a spectacle the record presents between William McKinley, the fearless representative of the people from the State of Ohio in 1888, and William McKinley, President of the United States in 1900, the mere agent of the Standard Oil trust, the most dangerous monopoly in all the land, and the greatest menace to-day to the stability of our finances and our free institutions. To-day there are over a hundred millions of dollars of the people's money deposited by the Secretary of the Treasury with pet national banks and not drawing a penny interest so far as the people are concerned.

The national banks, it is true, deposit with the Government bonds to secure these loans, but the national banks continue to draw interest on the bonds, and at the same time they loan out the people's money to the people and charge them on call loans in Wall street and other places interest from 6 to 186 per cent.

The national banks are oppressing the people and robbing them going and coming. The national banks are making hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars every year through the instrumentality of the Secretary of the Treasury. This outrage should be thoroughly investigated and remedial legislation speedily enacted. This is a most important matter and can not be ignored.

The answer of the Secretary of the Treasury to the resolution of inquiry of this House is a most remarkable document, and to me it seems to be a humiliating confession of dereliction of duty. Every citizen in the country should read the answer of the Secretary of the Treasury. It presents a sad condition of public affairs that should bring the blush of shame to the cheek of every honest and patriotic citizen.

His whole conduct in this matter from the beginning to the end is indefensible, suspicious, and reprehensible. No honest man can justify it or condone it. It demands the most searching and rigid investigation, and if the Secretary is the man his friends say he is he will insist, in justice to himself and to his reputation, on this investigation.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. SULZER. I ask for five minutes more; I could not get time yesterday.

Mr. CANNON. I do not see any prospect of this ceasing, but I hope my friend can have five minutes more.

Mr. SULZER. Give me five minutes more and I will try to conclude what I have to say.

Mr. CANNON. That will be satisfactory.

Mr. SULZER. Now, sir, under the law, I doubt if the National City Bank could buy the custom-house property. It is very questionable if it could under its charter. But be that as it may, it has held title to the property and held the purchase money of the people, not paid a cent of interest on it, charged the Government rent for the use of the building, and escaped the payment of taxes to the city and State of New York.

Mr. Chairman, let me read you an extract from a letter written to the Secretary of the Treasury by A. B. Hepburn, the vice-president of the Standard Oil bank, as long ago as June, 1897. It begins very familiarly:

MY DEAR MR. GAGE: * * * We would like to remain a United States depository. Of course the bank is very strong, and if you will take the pains to look at our list of directors you will see that we also have very great political claims in view of what was done during the canvass of last year.

A. B. HEPBURN.

Now, we want an investigation to find out who the directors of the Standard Oil bank are and what they did in the campaign of 1896 that they have very great political claims on the present Republican Administration.

I undertake to say that a fair and full investigation of the Treasury Department will expose the most deplorable condition of affairs ever known in the history of this country. Read the answer of the Secretary and refuse this investigation if you dare.

In that answer he practically confesses and admits the charges made against him. Let me read you another letter, written by James Stillman, the president of the National City Bank, and a relative, I am informed, of John D. Rockefeller. This letter is as follows:

THE NATIONAL CITY BANK OF NEW YORK.

New York, November 12, 1897.

DEAR SIR: Again referring to your letter of November 10, in which you advise us that a deposit will be made with this bank on the 22d instant of \$13,645,250, and also advise us that we will be directed, by the usual transfer order, to deposit with other designated depositories a part of this fund, in proportion to the securities they have lodged with the United States Treasurer for the purpose of qualifying themselves, permit me to say that, not knowing the extent to which other banks have deposited bonds for the sake of qualifying themselves as depositories, we are unable to estimate the proportion of such funds that will remain with us and therefore be subject to our use in current business.

We would esteem it a very great favor, therefore, if you can advise us approximately what percentage of the \$13,645,250 will remain with this bank. You, as a banker, can appreciate our desire to possess this information.

Yours, very respectfully,

JAS. STILLMAN, President.

Hon. LYMAN J. GAGE,

Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

Yes, indeed, he seems to have appreciated it, and his connection with it is one of the most discreditable things that has happened in the administration of public affairs in this country since the Belknap scandal and the whisky frauds. Mr. Gage, I am informed, is a national banker and is very familiar with the schemes of national banks to make money by taking advantage of the unsuspecting public. I am informed that Mr. Gage admits that he is still connected with national banks and owns stock in one.

There is a law on the statute books which prevents a man engaged in the importation business from acting as Secretary of the Treasury, and there ought to be a law that a man engaged in the banking business and owning stock in a national bank should not be eligible to act as the Secretary of the Treasury.

If I had the time, I could read from the letters sent to us by Mr. Gage many of a very suspicious character. The answer of the Secretary demands action by this House, and immediate action.

This matter will not down. The people are thoroughly aroused. They demand the right to know the entire truth, and they will insist on that demand until it is granted. The Standard Oil trust must not control the Treasury of the people, and no agent of the Rockefellers must be the Secretary of the Treasury. Mr. Gage's answer is very unsatisfactory, and the investigation must follow as a matter of right. If it does not, harsher measures looking to his impeachment will be instituted by honest and fearless representatives of the people. [Applause on Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SIBLEY. I regret exceedingly to be compelled to take a contrary view from my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. SULZER], whom I supported with great loyalty and zeal for the Democratic leadership of this House. I regret to differ with my friend, who is my choice for the second place on the Democratic ticket this year. Nevertheless, I must differ, and I will state briefly some of my reasons.

The New York World telegraphed me as follows:

NEW YORK, December 26, 1899.

Hon. JOSEPH C. SIBLEY, Franklin, Pa.:

The action of the Administration in making the National City Bank of Wall street, which is a Standard Oil concern, the center to which must flow all internal-revenue receipts is plainly a move toward monopoly and centralization. Kindly wire at World's expense your opinion of the move. Will you introduce a resolution to investigate? If so, please wire your draft or an outline of it, that we may print.

THE WORLD.

To which I replied:

The WORLD, New York:

Confronted with financial emergency, Secretary of Treasury has acted with promptness and prudence along legal lines. In my opinion the American Congress will always uphold the Administration authorities in protecting by legal methods our commercial and industrial prosperity from threatened disaster.

JOSEPH C. SIBLEY.

That was my individual opinion then, and I have not changed that opinion to this hour. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I have read the answer of the Secretary of the Treasury, and as a fair-minded man I accept it as a full, free, and frank statement of the conditions that justified him in each and all of these transactions. There was a conflagration existing in the city of New York, and a conflagration is easier stopped at the beginning than after it has met with the full sweep of the storm of adversity.

I glory in the fact that he had the courage and the will to check that conflagration at its inception, and that the panic which was then prevailing in the city of New York, when, as my friend [Mr. SULZER] says, money loaned up to 186 per cent, did not extend to all of the cities of this Union, north, south, east, and west. I would rather see business prosperity than partisan success [applause on the Republican side], and any triumph which must come to us as a party through the distress and suffering of the commercial, financial, and industrial interests of this country will come to us rather as a curse than as a help upon our onward way. [Applause on the Republican side.]

They have criticised the Secretary of the Treasury because he did not send money to Chicago and New Orleans and all the other cities of the nation. Why, you might as well criticise the chief of the fire department of the city of Washington, if the Treasury is on fire, because he does not send half the engines over to the navy-yard or some other portion of the city. He directed the water upon the place where the fire was kindling and he stopped the conflagration, and to-day money is loaning in New York at from 3 to 6 per cent, and the industrial enterprises of this nation are moving forward and employing labor, and labor is receiving its fair meed of reward, or if it is not it should do so, for it has the opportunity so to do.

I for one, voicing only my individual opinion, want to say with emphasis that I am glad, that I rejoice in the action of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States for those acts for which he has been criticised on the floor of this House. [Applause on the Republican side.]

To my mind he is entitled to receive from all who love the prosperity of their country, whose representatives we are, rather a vote of commendation than of condemnation.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I do not desire to enter into a discussion of the character or action of the Secretary of the Treasury. The answer that he made to the resolutions which were originally introduced carried conviction to the mind of every fair-minded man in this country that the Secretary of the Treasury was justified in all that he has done, that he not only stood personally vindicated at the end of the controversy, but had fully vindicated the conduct of the Administration in that behalf.

But I desire to refer to some complaints, or criticisms I might possibly term them, made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] against the Committee on Rules, because it had not made a report upon the resolutions which he has seen fit to introduce. It is fair that the Committee on Rules should be heard now upon this question briefly. The Committee on Rules is not a political machine, and the membership of this House has a right to have a fair and impartial action by that committee upon every resolution and matter that comes before it.

As I have already said—and I predicate my entire remarks upon the fact that I have alleged—the answer of the Secretary of the Treasury was a complete answer to all that had been alleged and was received with entire satisfaction, in my judgment, by the intelligent thinking men of the whole country.

Following that came another resolution, in substance a rehash of the same question. It may not be in the same language, but the purport and direction of the blow was for the same general purpose.

Now, shall the House hold that it is the duty of the Committee on Rules to put into motion an investigation every time that a member of this House sees fit to introduce a resolution for that purpose?

I am authorized by the chairman of the Committee on Rules to say that since the introduction of that resolution by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] no man has come to the Committee on Rules and asked to be heard in furtherance of the purpose manifested therein.

No man has come to the Committee on Rules and said, "This is the answer of the Secretary of the Treasury, but there is some of it that is not true; some of it is evasive; some of it is not fair." Nobody has said that. Shall the Committee on Rules be censured because they have seen fit thus far to put an end to a repetition of this character? Why, gentlemen, there is not a place in

the United States where you would put the humblest, the poorest, the most degraded citizen upon trial on the mere allegation of somebody that he had done something wrong. Let somebody come to the Committee on Rules and state that within his personal knowledge something here is not truthfully stated—not come and make general statements—and there will be no difficulty about a report from that committee instantly.

But while all the facts are disclosed, what is the opportunity of the House. Gentlemen may criticise this answer. They may say that there ought to be some action taken because of some of the admitted facts; but until those facts are disputed by somebody, what good to put the House of Representatives to the expense, from its contingent fund, of another investigation? The Committee on Rules should at least have as much information as an ordinary grand jury or prosecutor would have before the filing of an indictment or an information, and certainly that ought to be so after a full and complete report such as this one that we have here now.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I remember a great day in this House, when my friend from Pennsylvania, Mr. SIBLEY, did not have to go to the other side of the big aisle for his applause. [Applause on the Democratic side.] There is not a man in this body for whom I have more personal affection than I entertain for him. But his present position has put me in an extremely awkward attitude, for two reasons: In the first place, the newspaper men have discovered a fanciful physical resemblance between him and me, so much so that we are frequently mistaken for each other.

Mr. SIBLEY. Let me interrupt you to say that a gentleman just now, who was looking for Mr. CLARK of Missouri, came up and addressed me as Mr. CLARK.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, that is precisely the trouble about it. I should hate exceedingly to have the present speeches of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIBLEY] orated around over the country as mine. [Laughter.] But the chief difficulty about it is that in writing occasionally for the newspapers I devoted three whole columns not very long ago, before I knew of his change of base, to urging him as the Democratic nominee for Vice-President of the United States [laughter]; and while I do not withdraw my personal affection, I wish in this distinguished presence to withdraw that nomination and confer it on my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. SULZER], who is faithful to the cause at all times, in all places, and under all circumstances. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I honor Mr. SULZER for his courage and his fidelity exhibited amid environments which would discourage, dishearten, and appal a more timid man. His example is well worthy of imitation by Democrats everywhere.

In the Fifty-third Congress my friend from Pennsylvania occupied a position of exceeding glory. He was more exploited by Democratic newspapers than any other member of that body. I think nothing more splendid was ever uttered in this House than the first speech that my brother from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIBLEY] delivered here, in which he stated, if I mistake not, that he had been ostracized by the plutocrats of the East in his social relations and cut in his business relations because, as a matter of conscience, of reason, of patriotism, and of humanity he was in favor of the free and unlimited coinage of silver at 16 to 1. We hailed him as a hero and a martyr, because he was the only Congressman north of the Potomac River and east of the Allegheny Mountains who in the Fifty-third Congress stood faithful under all circumstances to the kind of Democracy that we preach in the Mississippi Valley. Even the Presidency itself was not beyond his reach that day. Members crowded about him—Democrats to applaud, Republicans to admire, and the Cleveland cuckoos to deride. That historic scene of which my friend was the central figure was worthy to be placed on immortal canvas by the pencil of a master artist.

Now all the applause that he can get is from the rank and historic enemies of the Democratic party, and my honest opinion is, without intending to be disrespectful or unkind, that his place in this House, and the place of those who entertain similar opinions, is on the other side of the big aisle. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Individually, I believe in the principles of the Democratic party as a matter of conscience, and I would rather fight ten Republicans in the open than fight one man masquerading in Democratic uniform and preaching Republican doctrines. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

A man has a right to be a Republican, if he can reconcile it with his conscience and love of country; I have no quarrel with him; but he should frankly avow himself a Republican and not place the burden of his sins on Democratic shoulders by improperly calling himself a Democrat.

LYMAN J. GAGE AND HEPBURN.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a few words about this bill. On the 5th day of June, 1897, Mr. A. B. Hepburn, vice-president

of the National City Bank of New York, wrote a letter to Hon. Lyman J. Gage, the Secretary of the Treasury, which I undertake to say, if unrebuked, is a disgrace to every American citizen Democrat or Republican. It is the grossest piece of effrontery in our vernacular. I will quote you part of that letter:

We should like to remain a United States depository as at present.

That is a laudable desire.

Of course the bank is very strong.

That is a good reason why it should be a depository. I wish to ask, if you gentlemen here have any conscience left, any reason, any decency, or any love for the principles underlying this splendid Republic, the last hope of constitutional government on the face of the earth, how you like this sentence from that letter?

If you will take the pains—

Says Mr. Hepburn—

to look at the list of directors, you will see we also have very great political claims in view of what was done during the campaign last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to have five minutes more.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Now, I put this question and press it home upon your minds and consciences: Is there a man in this House, on either side of the Chamber, who can conceive it to have been possible that in the days of Alexander Hamilton, Albert Gallatin, and Salmon P. Chase any man within the broad confines of this Republic would have had the gall to address such a letter as that to any one of those illustrious statesmen? Do you believe it? I do not. Of course Lyman J. Gage could not keep Hepburn from writing this letter; but he could have rebuked him for writing the letter, and it was his duty as an American citizen and chief financial officer of this Government to have rebuked him; but Mr. Gage seems to have thought the letter right and proper.

Mr. RICHARDSON. And he did not have to do what was asked him.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; he did not have to do it, but he did do it, nevertheless.

Mr. LACEY. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If you will give me five minutes, you can ask me all the questions you want.

Mr. LACEY. It would take longer than that to answer this. What did Andrew Jackson do as to the distribution of the deposits?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Andrew Jackson took the deposits of the United States Government away from a lot of corruptionists just such as this man Hepburn [loud applause on the Democratic side] and put them in the hands of honest men. [Renewed applause.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. He put them in the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. LACEY. He put them in some pet State banks?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. He put them in the Treasury of the United States, and that is the beginning of the Treasury system we have to-day. Now, if you want to ask another question, crack in. I would be glad for you to do so.

Mr. LACEY. You have not answered that fully. Did not he put those deposits with a lot of pet State banks?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not care anything about pet State banks or anything of the kind. Did Mr. Gage rebuke Mr. Hepburn? Nothing of the sort. Instead of rebuking Hepburn, he did the specific thing that Hepburn wanted him to do and conferred upon that bank the greatest favor that was ever conferred by any Government officer upon any bank since banks were instituted among men. Hepburn demanded this largess from Mr. Gage because he contributed boodle in 1896!

Now, I submit, if Mr. Hepburn had great claims on account of what they did for President McKinley in the campaign of 1896 by reason of the comparatively small favors that Lyman had conferred upon that bank prior to this last stupendous deal, then it will take a lightning calculator to estimate the amount of boodle which that bank will contribute to the Republican campaign in 1900 by reason of the colossal favors conferred by Mr. Gage recently. The plan seems to be between this bank and Mr. Gage, "You tickle me and I will tickle you" [laughter], because with \$300,000,000 of deposits at 6 per cent the bank will rake in \$18,000,000 per annum, and it can afford to give several millions to the Republican campaign fund this year.

Not only that; this bank is part and parcel of the Standard Oil Company of the United States, and perhaps Lyman J. Gage knows where to go and get some more boodle when it is needed. I undertake to say this, Mr. Chairman, that this letter of Mr. Hepburn will be the most widely circulated letter ever penned

since pens were first invented—discounting in that respect all the letters written by soldiers, statesmen, authors, travelers, and philosophers for the delight and instruction of mankind. Hepburn did not know exactly what he was doing when he wrote that letter, except that he was getting the swag. [Laughter.] I will tell you what else he has done. He has "damned himself to everlasting fame;" and while he was doing it he has also "damned Lyman J. Gage to everlasting fame."

EXAMPLE OF JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not abuse people because they differ with me politically. I will cite you a case of a man that I never was enamored of, to show what he did on a certain occasion, and which proves how jealous the old patriots were of their reputation. According to all the historians John Quincy Adams in a great many respects was one of the most disagreeable men, personally, that ever sat in the White House, always excepting the one immediately preceding William McKinley. [Laughter.] But John Quincy Adams was a patriot. He was clean. He was exceedingly careful of his reputation. He was above suspicion. When he was elected Senator of the United States he happened to own a small block of stock in the old United States Bank, of which Nick Biddle was president. So sensitive was John Quincy Adams as to his good name that before he would take his seat as Senator, believing that legislation might be required touching the interests of the bank, that he went and sold that stock, an example which I commend to the statesmen of all parties on both sides of this Chamber. Evidently Lyman J. Gage is not a close blood relation of John Quincy Adams. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. SIBLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am obliged to my complimentary friend from Missouri. Of course, being publicly notified that I am out of the Vice-Presidential race would have been somewhat humiliating had I not in my remarks voluntarily withdrawn in favor of my friend from New York. [Laughter.] But when my good friend speaks so kindly of my attitude in the past and reprovingly of my position in the present, permit me to tell him I claim equal honesty for both positions.

I believed then that bimetalism was sacred, that it rose above the dignity of a mere party measure; but events over which no political party has control have so changed conditions that we produced last year more gold alone than was added to the whole world's stock of money, more than has been added in both gold and silver since the history of man was first written. Responsive to that increase, the world's price level has risen. I believe a cause may be sacred in one hour and ridiculous at a later period.

I believe that if we elect a Democratic President in the year 1900, that man's term will begin and expire without the possibility of writing one line in the Federal statutes of this nation contrary to the will of the Republican majority insured for six years in the United States Senate. I am not fighting because I love to fight, but desire, so far as lies in my power, to do something practical and something helpful. When my friend commends me to take my seat on the other side of the Chamber, located here as pleasantly as I am, with good friends and neighbors who overlook my idiosyncrasies, I do not know as I shall accept that invitation; but, Mr. Chairman, if I do, I shall not feel altogether out of place.

Sir, sitting over here, as we do, upon the eastern side of the Chamber, I have thought there possibly might be a very great party advantage accruing to us if the Democrats could change sides, that we might thus be able to catch the morning sun shining in our faces; but sitting over here it shines on our backs until about 4 o'clock in the afternoon, and we rarely catch its beams until about the time it is setting. [Applause on the Republican side.]

My opinion is that if the Democratic party is going to achieve success, or deserve it, we must have a policy of our own. We must show something in the line of constructive statesmanship. [Applause on the Republican side.] Announce your Democratic policy, promulgate your measures, and if they commend themselves to my reason, and in their tendencies make for the uplifting of our country and our common humanity, I will keep step as near as possible with those who march in the front ranks. But if you invite me to a banquet of carping, criticising, and fault-finding, you will excuse me if I do not go along, but as politely as possible decline your invitation. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on this amendment is exhausted.

Mr. HEPBURN. I move to strike out the last two words. Mr. Chairman, there is rather a serious phase to this subject that I want to call attention to. The gentleman who began this debate saw fit to indulge in a grave, serious charge against one of the most prominent officers of this Government. I know that sometimes thoughtless people do not pay as much attention to the utterances of that gentleman as perhaps they ought. They are apt not to regard it, but when in his Representative capacity on the floor of this House he makes the grave charge that the Secretary of the

Treasury has admitted that he has violated the statutes and thereby has committed a crime, that charge ought to receive some rebuke. He makes that statement, sir, in the presence of a full and complete statement by the Secretary of the Treasury, accompanied by every scrap of correspondence upon this whole subject. The gentleman makes that statement simply because of a possible difference between him and others as to the construction of the statutes and the authority of the officer to act under that statute. He reads from a recent enactment requiring the Secretary of the Treasury to deposit a fund in the Treasury.

The Secretary, who, he says, admitted that he violated the law, specifically says that he has done what that act directed. And he is supported in that statement, and he gives all the facts and details of what he has done, by two decisions of the Supreme Court, by the opinion of the Attorney-General, by the opinion of the Comptroller of the Currency, and by the opinions of two of the most competent officers in the employ of the United States, all of them stating, in their judgment, that he has complied with the statute. And yet that gentleman, as a Representative here, has the temerity to declare that the Secretary has admitted that he has committed the crime of embezzlement.

I think that there ought not to be an investigation of the Secretary of the Treasury, because everything that he has done has been exhibited here. No man has intimated that other facts can be discovered than those that are now before the House and the country; and while it would seem to me that there is no call for an investigation of him, there ought to be some kind of rebuke to that member of Congress who will thus distort reports, distort facts, and in his place here slander honored officials of the Government. [Applause on the Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS and Mr. CANNON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, have I the floor?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not see the gentleman from Illinois on the left.

Mr. CANNON. As I want only about a half a minute and then shall ask to have the debate closed, and as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] last occupied the floor, I will yield, and hope the Chair will recognize me afterwards for five minutes.

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the defense of the Secretary of the Treasury, submitted by Republicans on either side of this Chamber, I desire to have read an article from the Chicago Tribune of yesterday, one of the leading Republican papers of Illinois.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Is that a Republican paper?

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. Yes; well known to be.

The Clerk read as follows:

EVIL DAYS FOR SECRETARY GAGE.

There was a disposition in many quarters to let the curtain fall upon the acts of the Treasury Department with reference to the recent stock panic in Wall street and to draw the mantle of charity around Secretary Gage's official measures with reference thereto. Whatever opinion the people may have had as to the wisdom of those measures, it was admitted by candid men that Mr. Gage had been actuated only by unselfish motives. That opinion remains unchanged. Mr. Gage's personal and official integrity in private or public acts can not be assailed successfully among the people who know him.

It must be said, however, that in repounging to the Democratic resolution calling for information in regard to the relations of the Treasury Department to the Standard Oil bank he has put some ugly weapons in the hands of his enemies. His response, including, as it does, some letters not strictly official in their nature, and which might have been withheld as purely private, reminds one forcibly of Emory Storrs's characterization of an old and lamented member of the Cook County bar. Mr. Storrs said of him: "I do not need to look up authorities to bring into court when I have him for an opponent, as I know well he will have all there are on both sides, and I can select from them all I may need to prove my case." Mr. Gage certainly has brought all the authorities into court in this instance, including those which were most against him.

He sent to the Senate two letters which can not easily be explained away, and Republican newspapers in the East are not even attempting to explain them away. One of them was from ex-Controller A. P. Hepburn, of the National City Bank, and the other from Mr. Stillman, president of that bank. Both these letters were printed in the Tribune yesterday.

Mr. Hepburn, in his letter, asked that his bank be allowed to remain a United States depository, one reason being that "our list of directors" will show "we have great political claims, in view of what was done during the canvass last year"—1896.

Mr. Stillman, in his letter, said the call loans of the bank, then out in Wall street, were \$56,000,000, and suggested that if the Secretary would defer the payments to be made by the bank to the Government on account of the Central Pacific road it would "help matters"—that is, the operations of the bank in Wall street would not be restricted by a decrease in loanable funds.

It has passed into a proverb that a cat may look at a king. So anybody may write a letter to the Secretary of the Treasury. The important fact is not that these two letters were written to Secretary Gage, but that he proceeded to act in both instances in accordance with the suggestions made to him. The public deposits in the National City Bank were increased—as Mr. Hepburn desired they should be. Those deposits rose from a few hundreds of thousands of dollars, at which sum they then stood, to ten or twelve millions per month. Furthermore, the payment to the Treasury Department of the Central Pacific money was deferred, in accordance with Mr. Stillman's suggestion, until it became convenient for the bank to hand the money over.

By his unsophisticated, guileless, and innocent transmission of these two letters to Congress Mr. Gage has convicted himself out of his own mouth and has established as true some of the gravest accusations made against the Administration by unfriendly critics. Mr. Gage has gone far, for example, to show that the National City Bank of New York deserves to be called, as it has been called by some Democratic newspapers, a "favored bank;" that

the relations of the Standard Oil Company to the Treasury Department, owing to the loan of bonds to the National City Bank, upon which deposits were based (of which advances the Treasury Department was specifically informed), are not remote, and, finally, that the Treasury Department has, on occasions when it should not justly have done so, meddled and muddled in Wall street stock operations, with which the Government of the United States has properly nothing to do.

What answer Mr. Gage will make to these accusations we can not say, but it is manifest that the Treasury Department needs a censor, so that the next time it is called on to transmit a mass of correspondence to either House of Congress that correspondence may be discreetly and discriminatingly edited.

What was it or what could it be to Mr. Gage that the Standard Oil bank had immense sums loaned out in Wall street on call? How can Mr. Gage explain the fact that Government money was loaned in large sums to the Standard Oil bank when he knew it to be such and when he had been advised in official correspondence that the bonds which qualified the National City Bank to act as a depository were obtained directly from the Standard Oil Company?

How can Mr. Gage justify that letter (also officially printed) in which he suggested that the visit of Mr. Stillman or Mr. Morgan to Washington might "be more disturbing than an order on the banks to transfer all their money to the subtreasury," and consequently the Secretary of the Treasury offered to meet them in Philadelphia at the Walton Hotel in private and clandestinely at a particular time?

Was it becoming in the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States to abscond from Washington to Philadelphia to meet the representatives of the Standard Oil bank or of any other financial institution in order to avoid possible public comment? Where should those representatives confer with him on business which would bear the light of day save at the office of the Secretary in the Treasury Department at the seat of Government?

We find it extremely awkward and difficult to answer some of these questions. The whole official course of Mr. Gage has been viewed by the Tribune "more in sorrow than in anger." He has fallen into every pit dug for his unwary feet by political and financial jobbers. They have taken continual advantage of his lack of experience in public affairs. Mr. Gage personally is as incorruptible as Aristides. Nobody for one instant questions his desire to serve the public faithfully and well. But owing to a one-sided education which taught him all a banker should know and little of what a public man should know, he has considered to be expedient and just things astute politicians would shrink from as imperiling their public and private reputations.

Mr. Gage has done nothing unbecoming a reputable banker. He has never asked whether any of his acts were unbecoming a Secretary of the Treasury. Any man who stood less high in the community than he does would unquestionably have subjected himself to grave suspicion. His only failing is that he has not exhibited in the conduct of public affairs the discretion of the politician as he displayed constantly in the management of a private financial institution the discretion of the banker.

The correspondent of the Chicago Record, a paper not unfriendly to Mr. Gage, said in its issue of yesterday that "it is quite safe to say Mr. Gage will not be in the next Cabinet if President McKinley should be reelected." It is perhaps as well that this information should be widely disseminated. The Republican party can not afford to stand for the policy which has been announced and thus far executed through the Treasury Department. Its affiliations with the Standard Oil Company and Wall street operators have been most unfortunate. "In spite of the callousness of so many of our business men," as the New York Evening Post says, "there is a great volume of popular wrath at and loathing for plutocracy."

During the reading of the foregoing, the time of Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS having expired, by unanimous consent, it was extended to allow the completion of the reading.

Mr. CANNON and Mr. CORLISS rose.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, a single word.

Mr. CORLISS. I ask the gentleman to yield to me for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that debate on this amendment is closed.

Mr. CANNON. I should like to get ahead with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. CORLISS. Very well; if I may be recognized after the reading of the next paragraph.

Mr. CANNON. I want to say a word, and then I want to ask the House to permit this bill to be read in good faith for amendment. I started out on the supposition that a little leeway, even although remarks might not be in order if the point of order were made, would, after a little while, clear the air and that we could make progress. I hope that that may be done.

Mr. CORLISS. With the assurance that I shall have permission to move to amend further on, I will wait.

Mr. CANNON. I do not desire to answer at length the attack of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER], or the attack of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], or anybody else, upon the Secretary of the Treasury, for the report of the Secretary of the Treasury speaks for itself. I have read it with care. I believe it is true, and for one man and one Representative I indorse every act of the Secretary of the Treasury in connection therewith. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, why go on and try to answer about Standard Oil, and about this man having committed an impeachable offense, and all that kind of thing. It is multiplying words, not worthy, in my judgment, of an answer. I can best illustrate how I feel about it by stating a recollection that I have when a boy out on the Wabash, before the day of railroads. They sometimes had religious discussions, and there was a three days' discussion between great religious lights in the neighborhood on the doctrine of election.

The old hard-shell Presbyterian of the old school took occasion in his remarks, as I recollect it, in discussing this matter of election, to say that the Lord had ordered everything from the beginning, and that there were infants in hell not a span long. There was a good old Methodist sister sitting by, and she did not go into any argument about it. She could not have disproved it any more than he could prove it, but she answered him by jumping up and

crying out, "I thank my God that is a lie." [Laughter.] There is no use in multiplying words with our friends. They are just mistaken, that is all.

Now I ask that progress may be made by reading the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on this amendment has been closed, and without objection the formal amendment will be considered withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For contingent expenses of the Executive Office, including stationery therefor, as well as record books, telegrams, telephones, books for library, miscellaneous items, and furniture and carpets for offices, care of office carriage, horses, and harness, being for the fiscal years as follows:

For the fiscal year 1900, \$2,279.18.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN.]

[Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to discuss the question being considered here, but to call the attention of the chairman of the committee and the House to a paragraph in this bill further along and make some remarks pertaining to the department that has reference thereto.

On page 2 of the bill you will find a provision authorizing an increase in the appropriations for the Supervising Architect's Department of \$40,000. We find that whenever a department has become ineffective by the dry rot of civil service it comes to Congress for an additional appropriation in order to inject a little life into that department without trying to remedy the evil within the department, and if you will bear with me for about ten minutes, as I will require that time, I desire to give to the members of this House my experience with this department of the Government, in order that they may know what the people of their districts must endure unless that department is changed to some extent.

Many of the members here have secured appropriations for the erection of public buildings in their district. One was granted to my district fourteen years ago, and at the expiration of twelve years the building was completed. When we moved into the new building it was found that the different departments were too large to go into the building, and the old public building was required. In order to utilize it it had to be repaired. Congress considered the matter and authorized the building to be retained, and in June, 1898, an appropriation of \$20,000 was granted for the proper repair of that building.

The Supervising Architect's Office is entirely under the civil-service law, and the Supervising Architect, when appointed by the President, was eulogized by the Civil Service Reform League as a man entirely worthy and competent to fill that position; and I want time enough to present to this House facts that can be substantiated, in order that the people of my district, at least, will not hold me responsible for the incapacity of the Supervising Architect's Office.

In June, 1898, Congress appropriated \$20,000 to repair an old public building. The plans had been submitted to the Supervising Architect upon which to base the estimate of the repairs needed. The public were paying for accommodation for public offices, the appraiser, the pension office, the Light-House Board, and other departments in my city, \$7,000 a year for rental in private buildings, and we were very anxious to utilize the old building for the purpose of cutting off these expenses.

That building is not completed to-day, notwithstanding the fact that eighteen months have expired, and almost every day, every month at least, the Supervising Architect has been asked and urged and entreated to proceed to the completion of that building for the benefit of the public. He has had eighteen months to expend \$20,000 for the repair of the old public building that any private owner could put in proper repair for the accommodation of the public department in that city in sixty days' time.

I believe it is my duty, sir, standing here representing the people of my city, to state these facts. This building is in the heart of our city, in one of the best business sections. The building has been closed for two years, and the merchants and business men surrounding it have complained because the building is there silent and idle when the public service requires its use.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CORLISS. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

Mr. CANNON. I do hope my friend will content himself with moving to amend this section, if such is his intention, when it is reached.

Mr. CORLISS. I move to strike it out.

Mr. CANNON. But it has not been reached.

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to stand in the position of opposing an appropriation here if the chairman and the committee's investigation of it show that it ought to be granted.

Mr. CANNON. Will my friend want to be heard on this section again when it is reached?

Mr. CORLISS. Not if I am granted sufficient time to cover the facts now.

Mr. CANNON. With that statement I will not object to an extension of five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks an extension of five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CORLISS. My purpose, Mr. Chairman, in talking to the committee now is because from the discussion that is going on I am afraid the paragraph will not be reached. I do not wish to eliminate this appropriation if upon investigation the committee believes it ought to be made. I rather encourage it, but I desire to call attention of the officials of the Treasury Department to the absolute incapacity or lack of proper attention of the officers of the Architect's Department.

Now, one other step along the lines of the improvement here. Not only eighteen months have been wasted and an expenditure of \$9,000 paid out by our Government for rent of private quarters because this building is not completed, but in a new public building completed and occupied by the Post-Office Department it was found that in the rear, where the mail had to come into the building, an addition should be constructed at a cost of about \$500, in order to protect the mail men who come up with their carriages and unload the mail and carry it in the post-office. To-day, and for the last two years, they have been doing that work exposed to the rain and the storm, with no cover for their protection.

The Supervising Architect was asked by the postmaster and the custodian of the building and by myself and a Senator to make an extension that would cost \$500 for the protection of the clerks in that new building. The money has been appropriated. He promised to do the work. He has repeatedly promised for two years to do it, but to-day the men are standing there working in the rain storms because of the incapacity or the indifference of the Supervising Architect; and I submit that such a man ought to be compelled to do the work of his department properly and for the proper economy of the people and for the interests of the section in which the building is located or he should be removed from office.

One other point. Ninety days ago, when one elevator in the new building—the one nearest the center of the city—where 90 per cent of the people enter the building for the purpose of reaching the courts and the departments above, the elevator became out of repair, and that elevator has been permitted to stand idle for ninety days, and every person who goes into the building, to the court room, and to the collector of customs' office, and to the collector of internal revenue's office is compelled to travel nearly 400 feet through the building to reach the further elevator.

I call attention to these matters because, Mr. Chairman, I have called the attention of the Supervising Architect to it and his lack of attention to these matters until I am tired, and I desire the people of my district to know that when I find a department in Washington neglecting its duty and not expending the public money in the interest of the people—for the economy of the people—I will stand upon this floor and criticize him, whether it be the Supervising Architect or any other member of the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, I want publicly to ask the attention of the Secretary of the Treasury to the facts that I have stated. I desire the committee, in the consideration of other matters that will come up with reference to the Supervising Architect, to take into consideration the statements that I have made here and to ask him whether or not he has been guilty of the charges that I make. And unless he can show greater efficiency in some other direction—in some other buildings—to overcome such neglect of public interests, I submit it is high time that he should be removed from office.

Mr. GROSVENOR. You can not do it.

Mr. CORLISS. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] says we can not do it, and I suppose he means because he is under the civil-service law. I submit, Mr. Chairman, there is a power to reach men in public life, notwithstanding the fact that they are under the civil-service law, and that power is here, and unless it is exercised pretty quickly the voice of the people will come here and demand that the entire civil-service law be repealed.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on this amendment is exhausted. Without objection, the formal amendment will be considered as withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of the Secretary: For two clerks, at the rate of \$900 per annum each; and six paper counters and laborers, at the rate of \$620 per annum each, in the division of loans and currency; in all, \$1,380.

[Mr. QUARLES addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia, that he may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] made his remarks here this morning, criticising the action of the Secretary of the Treasury, my attention has been called to a very able editorial that appeared recently in the Greenville News, of South Carolina, a leading Democratic paper of that State, which shows clearly and conclusively that the Democracy of South Carolina is not in harmony with the views of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] in his tirade of abuse against Mr. Gage. And to show to my Democratic friends and my Republican colleagues how the rank and file of the Democracy view the action of Secretary Gage, I ask the Clerk to read such portions of the editorial as I have marked.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TO BRETHREN.

One of the most pressing needs of the South is breadth of view and modern thought in our newspapers. It is a depressing fact that most of the local newspapers in this section are running in the ruts of thirty years ago. They have not caught the spirit of freedom and independence that guides and governs the world of to-day. They hark back to old and dead issues, stick to old methods, are apparently unable to comprehend the changes that have come. Our observation is that the newspapers are far behind the people. In cities and towns and the country alike we find men and women thinking for themselves and considering political conditions from businesslike points of view, studying the effects of public issues and matters on the interests of themselves and their surroundings. Most of the newspapers, on the other hand, are thinking the thoughts of dead men or flocking along blindly after leaders, more or less blind, following empty names and guiding themselves by unmeaning and useless sentiment.

We are moved to these observations by the dismay, bewilderment, and anger which many of our esteemed contemporaries express from time to time because of things said and done by the Greenville News. They can not understand how it is that a Democratic newspaper warmly approves many of the policies and acts of a Republican Administration and disapproves the policies and acts of men who call themselves Democrats and of a God-forsaken band of political vagrants who blasphemously call themselves the Democratic party. In the honest opinion of many of these contemporaries such a thing is impossible. A newspaper which does not decry and snarl at, misrepresent, and belittle every act of a Republican Administration and abuse every Republican official must, they think, be Republican.

It [a contemporary] can not understand why this newspaper should defend Mr. Gage, the Republican Secretary of the Treasury, against Mr. SULZER, the Democratic Congressman from New York. Mr. Gage is a man who, by his integrity, ability, and energy, put himself at the head of the banking business in one of the world's largest cities. He is recognized by the whole world as an authority on finance. He has proved that his knowledge is accurate and practical by successfully managing great financial enterprises. Considering Mr. Gage's history, we find it hard to believe that he has made any very serious error in financial management or has joined in with anybody to rob the Government or to openly and flagrantly use Government funds to enrich himself or his friends. On the other hand, we know Mr. SULZER, of New York, to be a cheap and frothy East Side Tammany politician, a man who has never given any evidence of talent or learning or ability of any kind.

[Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

We know that the attack on Mr. Gage was led by the New York World and Journal, newspapers which live by being sensational and which notoriously disregard truth. Using this general knowledge of the men concerned and applying common sense, we said that when Mr. Gage's actions were investigated it would be found that he had acted wisely and honestly. We can not accept the fact that Mr. Gage is part of a Republican Administration as proof that he is fool or knave or both; nor can we regard Mr. SULZER as a statesman and master of finance because he calls himself a Democrat. Now, Mr. Gage's answer is before the public. It seems to us to prove that he had sound reasons for placing the Government money as he did and to make the clamor against him absurd. We think the business men of the whole country, who study affairs in a businesslike and open-minded way, will have the same opinion. Of course, the newspapers which hold blind partisanship to be their first and whole duty will continue to demand Mr. Gage's impeachment.

The weakness and folly of the partisanship of most of the Southern newspapers will be best understood if we suppose the case reversed. Suppose Mr. McKinley proceeded on the theory that no Democrat could be honest or trustworthy. There would not be a Democratic postmaster of any grade or census official or any other Federal officer anywhere in the country. If he chose to show the feeling toward the South which so many Southern newspapers show toward him, he could make this a hell on earth.

The Administration has fought and won a war and has treated the South kindly in every way. The whole country is prospering as it has not prospered in years. Our State is going ahead with a rush. We have every reason to be satisfied. The Greenville News will not deny these plain facts, nor, because the men under whose guidance these facts are developed are called Republicans, snarl at or abuse or belittle them. Nor will we cry out to try the experiment of handing the Government over to a lot of men because they call themselves Democrats, whose methods and principles we believe would bring disaster on the country. We are following common sense and principles, not names and empty sentiments; we are dealing with the facts as they are now, not with facts as they were in reconstruction days, or the memories of wrongs done by men who are dead. We are living in to-day and looking to tomorrow, and are not living in 1876 and looking to 1865. We are going forward, not backward, looking around at the world and seeing; not raking in old muck heaps, like the man in Pilgrim's Progress.

The Greenville News is a Democratic newspaper because it believes in Democratic principles and holds to them; it approves most of the policies and methods of the Administration because they accord with those principles and the country is prospering, booming, growing under them. It will not, because Bryan, Altgeld, and Tillman call themselves Democrats, go with them into the Populist camp or help to hand a machine which is running smoothly and beautifully to them to tamper and tinker and try fool experiments with.

We would be glad to have many Southern contemporaries study the situation and stand with us.

[Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Does not the gentleman know that that was a paper that supported President McKinley in 1896?

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I sought to introduce on the 4th of January seems to be no longer necessary

to elicit the facts which I then desired from the Secretary of the Treasury. I believed at that time that the Secretary of the Treasury neither appreciated nor understood the financial situation in New York and elsewhere during the last three months of 1899. I have read his voluminous report, and I find no reason therein for changing my belief.

To his failure to act at the right time, when repeatedly requested to do so, may be charged the late stringency in the money market, so largely affecting banking and business interests, and the facts admitted in his report prove that he is directly responsible for the serious conditions existing at that time.

I thought it was proper that the people of the United States, and especially the citizens of New York, should know why the Secretary delayed in exercising the power which section 5153 of the Revised Statutes gives him, and which he now invokes in his defense, and why he finally availed himself of this authority when the panic was over.

That a severe stringency of money has lately affected business interests in New York and throughout the country no one who reads can doubt. That the Secretary was advised of its approach and its causes no one can dispute. If the means of averting the panic were available at all times, why did the Secretary lack the foresight or neglect to make use of them?

As early as September 27, 1899, I urged the Secretary of the Treasury to relieve the threatened stringency and sent him the following telegram:

I respectfully urge that you use every means possible to relieve the present tension in the money market. That in the midst of such prosperity there should be a dearth of money to transact the country's business, the same being due solely to absorption by the Treasury, through taxation, of the surplus, would be ludicrous were it not so costly to the farmer, mechanic, and business man alike. Every resource should be exhausted to promptly end the present stringency.

The Secretary replied through his Assistant Secretary that the Government was not absorbing money needed in business circles; that the receipts and expenditures of the Government almost balanced from day to day, and that he had relieved the situation by anticipating the October interest. And in further response to my inquiry, wherein I warned him that every day's delay in affording relief meant a month's delay in the progress of the prosperity of the people, and that the larger national banks with deposits of \$25,000,000 and over had a selfish interest in maintaining a close money market—as everyone at that time knew, and as subsequent events prove—he replied that “it does not appear at this time that there is any great necessity for increasing deposits in national banks, and to do so in the case of New York banks would likely invite criticism of unfair discrimination against other sections of the country desiring also to be the recipients of deposits.” And, further, that “whatever stringency there is in the market at this season of the year must therefore be attributed to some other reason than the absorption of the money of the country by the Treasury.” This letter was written on the 6th of November, 1899.

The Secretary, in these letters, would neither admit a stringency nor permit himself to believe that it was due to the accumulation of the surplus in the Treasury. In fact he denied that there was a surplus.

Within three weeks thereafter he offered to purchase \$25,000,000 of bonds, thereby admitting that some relief was necessary and proving that a surplus did exist. And in his reply to the Senate resolution of inquiry he further shows that his statement in his letter was erroneous, when he declares that revenue receipts are increasing from month to month and that the business world demanded assurances that this surplus should be diverted from Treasury vaults to public depositories.

The business world had been demanding this for some months prior to the Secretary's action, but he was not prepared or was unwilling to comply with its demands. The prepayment of the October interest was trifling, while the purchase of bonds did not afford relief to the business world, but did advance the price of these bonds \$20,000,000, which the Government will have to pay when the generally announced refunding plan is put in operation.

The Secretary either erred in judgment or was illy advised by those most interested in a continuance of the stringency in the money market, and every citizen who has contributed through taxation to make possible the surplus in the Treasury is compelled to criticise the grave blunder—for it is nothing less—which the Secretary committed in his subsequent action.

Forgetful of, or ignoring entirely, his written statement that a surplus did not exist and that, even if it did, unfavorable criticism would be invited if he deposited Government receipts in New York banks, when the panic was at its acutest stage, when the enormous rate of 186 per cent was charged for call money, when the tension was so great that private relief came to the assistance of banks, then the Secretary selected the very institution which by reason of its large deposits and financial ramifications was able to dictate the price of money until prohibitive rates had been reached, and that institution was made the chief depository of Government funds.

I do not charge collusion, but I do maintain that the Secretary lacked financial judgment.

However, the Secretary was too late, and the evil which he failed to avert had already overwhelmed banking and business houses. One instance of its far-reaching result may be cited from New England.

During the months of October, November, and December banking failures in New England aggregated in amount \$14,000,000, while for the entire year failures in the same section of the country amounted to \$14,207,585; or, in other words, for nine months failures only reached the sum of \$207,585, while for the three months during which time the Secretary refused to grant relief failures aggregated \$14,000,000.

The Secretary, in his reply to the Senate resolution of inquiry, gives as his second reason for depositing internal-revenue receipts and utilizing national banks as depositaries the following:

Second. * * * That the revenues are now largely exceeding disbursements from month to month and seem likely to do so for an indefinite period. This condition would be a menace to the business world if assurance were not given that this surplus would be diverted from Treasury vaults to public depositaries, where, while secure to the Government, it would remain available to public use.

This is precisely what the Secretary had been urged to do on November 6, 1899, and had refused to do, saying "that there was no necessity for increased deposits in national banks," and "that the stringency in the money market must not be attributed to the absorption of money of the country by the Treasury."

I am not one of those who criticize the Secretary for depositing the internal-revenue receipts in national banks—as he had authority to do—but I desire to emphasize and insist upon this fact, that his delay in making such deposits brought on the late stringency, and that he was either ignorant of the true situation or carelessly refused to heed the warnings given to him, and willfully neglected to take steps to prevent a panic. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Secretary, by his great and serious blunder, and by his failure to grasp the recent financial situation, has not only involved his Department and this Administration in a scandal which can not be explained, but has deliberately interfered with the progress of our prosperity. Fortunately, this country is so great and resourceful that it will only halt in its advance to wonder at the blindness of the Secretary and then progress with renewed activity.

The world depends upon us for bread. The East needs our cotton and manufactures. As we have expanded as a nation, in that direction will we expand as a mercantile power. We will supply Europe with iron, and I believe the day is not far distant when we will supply her with coal. The day has passed when we are compelled to appeal to the money centers of Europe for money to aid our enterprises. New York is fast becoming the financial center of the world, and with a liberal but discriminating hand she extends aid to all parts of the United States. If, however, we are to be subjected to the favoritism and mistakes in financial policy such as we have witnessed during the closing months of the past year, confidence will be shaken in our financial system at home and abroad, and other crises will be precipitated, each more disastrous in its effect.

The lesson which this short-sighted policy of the Secretary of the Treasury teaches is that when the reason for a tax ceases to exist, the tax should be abolished if the surplus derived therefrom becomes a menace to industrial and commercial enterprises, and pending its abolition the surplus should be controlled by some able financier. To lock it up in the vaults of the Treasury withdraws it from business channels. The Secretary can not go on indefinitely purchasing bonds and depositing receipts without charging interest therefor in national banks. The money belongs to the people, who contributed it to the Government through taxation; and if a surplus is gradually accumulating, the tax which is responsible for it should be decreased in proportion as the surplus has increased. If the Secretary of the Treasury is able to deposit \$30,000,000 to \$40,000,000, which will represent the surplus for this year, as he says in his reply, and if in addition thereto he is able to purchase \$25,000,000 of bonds, this surplus should be returned to the people by reducing the war tax by exactly that amount. [Applause.]

During the delivery of the above remarks the time of Mr. LEVY expired.

Mr. LEVY. I ask for five minutes' more time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to continue for five minutes.

Mr. CANNON. As this is the closing speech of debate by consent, I hope it will be given.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. LEVY resumed and concluded his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate upon the pending amendment has been exhausted.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of Auditor for Treasury Department: For three clerks of class 1, \$900.

Mr. DRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I sat here a few moments ago

and listened with a great deal of interest to the debate that occurred between the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania and the equally distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON rose.

Mr. DRIGGS. I believe that is the end of the paragraph?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; it is the end of the paragraph.

Mr. DRIGGS. I only ask for five minutes.

Mr. CANNON. But no amendment is offered, and I do want to conclude this bill to-day.

Mr. DRIGGS. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CANNON. Now, the gentleman is proceeding out of order except by unanimous consent. I will ask unanimous consent for five minutes for debate that is not relevant to the bill on that side and five minutes to this side, and then we proceed with the bill in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. RICHARDSON. That applies to this section, as I understand.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no; I want to go on with the bill.

Mr. GAINES. I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. CANNON. We have a census bill to-morrow and a pension bill the next day, when the gentlemen can get in their speeches.

Mr. DRIGGS. The opportunity will be lost if we have to wait. The opportunity is here. I believe I am recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Why, then I absolutely give notice, so that there may be no mistake about it, that after ten minutes further debate—

Mr. DRIGGS. Does this come out of my time?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, not at all. (Continuing:) By consent, and I will insist upon the enforcement of the rule.

Mr. DRIGGS. To proceed, then. With the controversy between the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania and the distinguished gentleman from Missouri I have no desire to take issue, for each of them are trumps in their respective ways. I might say that one is the ace of hearts and the other is the ace of diamonds, for one is all heart as a Democrat, and the other a bright diamond in the principles of the Democracy in which he believes.

But, sir, I do take issue with the remarks made by the gentleman from Illinois a few minutes ago when he alluded to the Republicans on that side of the House and the Republicans on this side. I intend to apply that to myself, for he unquestionably alludes to the so-called Gold Democrats on this side of the Chamber. I intend to say, if you please, that whenever the issue about circulation of money comes up, or whenever any debate may occur in this House, wherever any question is raised on any financial matters, it seems that some Democrat on this side of the House takes an opportunity to attack some of their fellow-Democrats who do not chance to believe with them in the theory of the free and unlimited coinage of silver.

I say now, Mr. Chairman, in that much-misused phrase, "I am a Democrat," that I am as good a Democrat as there is on the floor of this House. And my colleagues who stood with me on this side of the House in support of the gold-currency measure, introduced by the other side, are as good Democrats as there are on this side of the House.

Now, then, Mr. Chairman, to what are we entitled in our Democracy, and what do we believe in as Democrats? There is no man on this side of the House who is a firmer believer in a constitutional amendment for the purpose of establishing an income tax than I. There is no man on this side of the House who is more bitterly opposed to the doctrines of the President, and for which the Republican party is solid, for the passage of a ship subsidy bill.

There is no Democrat on this side of the House who is more opposed to the increase of the standing army; and I believe absolutely that the welfare and the future integrity and the strength of this nation are to be placed in the Volunteer Army, that army in which Jackson and Jefferson and all our great generals have had implicit confidence, and, sir, there is no Representative on this side of the House more opposed to the trusts than I.

Coming now to the present question, I hold, sir, when certain Democrats would set themselves on a pedestal of the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 and say to every class of Democrat, "Unless you fall down and worship this idol you are no Democrat," they are the violators of the first principles of Democracy, for these principles are free speech, freedom of action, freedom of right, and freedom of debate; and my constituents of the Third Congressional district in the State of New York, more than 21,000 of whom, out of a total vote of 41,000 votes cast, told me on election day of November 8, 1898, that I was a Democrat, and as a Democrat was elected to this House of Representatives. I care not what you may say about my Republicanism, and my Democratic constituency will tell this House this coming November whether my Democracy is satisfactory to them.

I am not a Republican. "I am a Democrat."

As such I believe in the gold standard, and I can be as radical in that belief as you, my colleagues, in your free and unlimited coinage ideas, for the free and unlimited coinage of silver at a ratio of 16 to 1 is not bimetalism; it is silver monometallism. Now that this debate has come up here to-day, should we of the Democracy not be willing to concede something?

Why should we not be willing to say, "You go a certain way and we will go a certain way?" And surely we can meet on common ground somewhere instead of going before the country as we do, and as members have done on this side, calling us Republicans when we are not. For one, I say it is unfair to certain Democrats on this side of the House. And we are all Democrats; not one Republican can be found sitting here, excepting in the "Cherokee Strip." If there is any breach in our ranks, let us close, not widen, it. Why not make a serious and earnest attempt to meet on some common ground that will absolutely unite and not disunite the great Democratic party?

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

Furnishing new post-office building, Washington, D. C.: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to provide the new post-office building, Washington, D. C., with furniture, including gas and electric-light fixtures, carpets, awnings, window shades, \$5,500.

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Add, after the word "dollars," in line 6, page 4, the following: "Also, to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to provide the new post-office building in Kansas City, Mo., with elevators to complete that building, \$35,000."

Mr. CANNON. To that, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order, and for the following reason: The limit of cost of the public building in Kansas City has been appropriated for, and this breaks the limit, goes clear beyond the limit, and because it changes existing law; therefore it is not in order under the rule in relation to general appropriation bills.

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, I thought the gentleman from Illinois was through.

Mr. CANNON. I want the point of order disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, I had hoped the gentleman from Illinois might withhold the point of order on that amendment, because of the very urgent need of the Government for the appropriation. Permit me to say in passing, while it is not just on the point of order, that if this appropriation is held up, as it probably must be for several months unless it goes in this bill, every month of that time will cost the Government from six to eight hundred dollars additional. The new post-office building at Kansas City is practically completed excepting elevators and some finishing work. A portion of the Government offices will be moved into it in the spring, and some must move as soon as possible, as they are now occupying rented premises and their leases either have expired or soon will expire. Other officials, and especially the courts, can not move until the elevators are in place. Thus the Government will be compelled to maintain both buildings, necessitating a double force of janitors and engineers and a largely increased cost of maintenance.

Now, on the point of order, I contend that an urgent deficiency bill is not a general appropriation bill, and therefore is not included in the bills mentioned in the second section of Rule XXI. If I remember rightly, in the rule as it stood originally the general appropriation bills were specifically mentioned, and later the rule was changed so as to include deficiency bills with general appropriation bills.

Now, Mr. Chairman, a deficiency bill is a general appropriation bill, but I contend that it must be a general deficiency bill, not a special deficiency bill. When the gentleman brought in the deficiency bill at the last Congress appropriating \$50,000,000 for the support of the Army, he did not bring it in as a general bill under the rule, but asked unanimous consent for its consideration. When he brought in a deficiency bill appropriating about \$40,000, \$5,000 for the payment of special and temporary clerks in this House, and something over \$30,000 for the payment of clerks under the revenue department, and \$1,900 for the payment of election expenses, three or four different items appropriating about \$40,000, it was not contended that it was a deficiency appropriation bill that would come under the rule that is raised in this case.

Now, there can be but one deficiency bill, and that is a general appropriation bill. Otherwise, Mr. Chairman, where will you draw the line?

If they can bring in an urgent deficiency appropriation bill, then they can bring in a special urgent deficiency appropriation bill. If they can not include three items, as was specially held on the floor of the House, I ask you whether twenty items make a general deficiency bill? General appropriation bills are those named in the old rule and one or two added since, one of which is the general deficiency bill, and I contend, therefore, that the rule as

laid down is not applicable to items enumerated in this bill, because this is not one of the general appropriation bills.

Next, this is public work already in progress, a work appropriated for, a work that has almost reached completion. The Chair will remember that in the last House, when the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Mudd] offered an amendment on an appropriation bill providing for the erection of new buildings at Annapolis, at the Naval Academy, it was held to be in order, after a long and exhaustive debate, because it was a work already in progress.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, a single word in reply to the gentleman from Missouri. Rule XI, fixing the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations, says:

To appropriation of the revenue for the support of the Government as herein provided, viz, for legislative, executive, and judicial expenses; for sundry civil expenses; for fortifications and coast defenses; for the District of Columbia; for pensions, and for all deficiencies: to the Committee on Appropriations.

Now, this bill on inspection—and the Chair must inspect it—speaks for itself. It is entitled "A bill making appropriation to supply urgent deficiencies," etc., "and for other purposes," covering some 40 or 50 pages, carrying between fifty and sixty million dollars. It is, in fact, the principal deficiency bill. Now, under this grant of jurisdiction, I do not understand that you are confined to one bill. You may report several deficiency bills. There is nothing in the rule that would prevent the reporting of two so-called sundry civil bills or two legislative bills. You could make a general bill for each Department, if you saw proper, under this rule. As to the other point, that this is a public work in progress—

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not want to take the floor to say anything, but I want to ask the gentlemen if the rule does not define what a general appropriation bill is?

Mr. CANNON. It does not.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Does it not mention the general appropriation bills?

Mr. CANNON. No.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I think the gentleman will find that the general appropriation bills are mentioned.

Mr. CANNON (reading). "And for all deficiencies."

Mr. RICHARDSON. I understand that, but look at Rule XXI and see if it does not mention the general appropriation bills.

Mr. CANNON. I am speaking of the grant of power. This says "and for all deficiencies."

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not want to be understood as either favoring or opposing the point of order, because it is a matter that I have seen decided here, and I was rather inclined to be in favor of the position the gentleman is taking, when the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Cowherd] first mentioned it to me; but you will find that general appropriation bills are mentioned there.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is speaking of Rule XXI now?

Mr. RICHARDSON. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. I have been reading from Rule XI.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I know that, but Rule XXI mentions the general appropriation bills, and says they shall be in order when reported from the Committee on Appropriations. The question is whether the urgent deficiency bill is a general appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON. I will read clause 2 of Rule XXI:

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law.

Now, this is a general deficiency appropriation bill; or, if the gentleman sees proper to look at it in that way, a general urgent deficiency appropriation bill, consisting of many items, and I think it comes within the letter of the rule, and certainly within the spirit of it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman at all, but on that line would you not find some difficulty in that position, when you consider that there is a general deficiency bill?

Mr. CANNON. Not at all.

Mr. RICHARDSON. A bill that you call the general deficiency bill?

Mr. CANNON. Not at all. There may be two.

Mr. RICHARDSON. If the gentleman is correct in saying that there can be two general deficiency bills, and that an urgent deficiency bill is one of the two general deficiency bills, then he would have no difficulty in his position.

Mr. CANNON. I have no doubt of that.

Mr. RICHARDSON. You do not call it that in the rule. Why do you not call it a general deficiency bill? You come and call it an urgent deficiency bill and make no provision that that shall be privileged.

Mr. CANNON. Rule XI does not speak of any general deficiency bill. It is peculiar in that respect. I will again read clause 3 of Rule XI:

To appropriation of the revenue for the support of the Government, as herein provided, viz, for legislative, executive, and judicial expenses; for sundry civil expenses; for fortifications and coast defenses; for the District

of Columbia; for pensions, and for all deficiencies: to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. COWHERD. I hope the gentleman has not misunderstood my argument. I do not contend that this matter would not properly come before the Committee on Appropriations, but I contended that it would not come in under Rule XXI, because this was not a general appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON. Well, now, I say it is a general appropriation bill, and in point of fact, on inspection, I think it is the most general deficiency appropriation that has been reported for many a long year in the House.

Mr. BARTLETT. It is the biggest one.

Mr. CANNON. Yes; covering fifty or sixty pages, and that it is within both the letter and spirit of the rule. What was the object of clause 2 of Rule XXI? It was to prevent legislation upon the great money bills, because there was an evil attending such legislation, namely, that the great money bills must pass or the Government must stop. Therefore it was not good legislation to hitch on legislative provisions to the money bills that must pass and let them drag through obnoxious legislative provisions or legislative provisions not carefully considered. Therefore this rule was made. Now, it comes within the letter and spirit of the prohibition in clause 2. As to the gentleman's other point, a word, and then I will close:

Unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress; nor shall any provision changing existing law be in order in any general appropriation bill.

Now, what is the existing law? That there shall be constructed at Kansas City a public building expressly provided for, not exceeding a certain limit. Now, that limit has been appropriated for; and when you go beyond the legislation, and appropriate additional money for that public building, it changes the existing law, namely, that the building shall not cost exceeding \$2,000,000, if that is the limit.

Then there is another class of public works that abound in appropriation, and clause 2 refers to that class of works, where they are in progress, where a beginning has been made without limitation, and then appropriations for such public works are in order upon appropriation bills. But this is not one of the class referred to.

I am ready to have the Chair rule.

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, one further word. In regard to the question of the work being in progress, I am willing to admit that it has been ruled by former occupants of the chair that such an appropriation as this did not come within the exceptions to the rule of a work in progress. But I want to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that that ruling was opposed by no less a parliamentarian than Thomas B. Reed, the late Speaker of this House, when it was made.

Now, in regard to the question whether this is a general appropriation bill or not, the gentleman says they might bring in several general appropriation bills. I submit to the Chair that they can not bring in several general appropriation bills affecting one particular subject. They can not bring in several general deficiency bills, because one general deficiency bill covers the general deficiencies, and others like this are special deficiencies; and the gentleman recognized that twice in the last House, when he brought in bills of that nature before this House and asked unanimous consent for their passage instead of putting them upon the question of privilege.

Mr. CANNON. My friend can not claim that such action makes a concession upon my part that he is correct in that argument. During the Spanish war I did, every day or two, come in and report bills carrying sometimes one item, sometimes two or three, sometimes without printing. And for convenience—because it was the quickest and easiest way, without raising any question—I asked unanimous consent to consider them; and, so far as I recollect, without regard to the rules, with a patriotic spirit on both sides, we did not stop to inquire what the rules were, but the subject itself carried the unanimous consent.

Mr. COWHERD. Will the gentleman answer a question?

Mr. CANNON. If I can.

Mr. COWHERD. Is it not a fact that a few years ago—I do not know just when—when there was a deficiency in the payment of fees to marshals and jurors in the United States courts—did not the gentleman bring in a bill appropriating some \$375,000, and was it not ruled that that was not a general appropriation bill and did not come under the rule?

Mr. CANNON. I do not recollect such a ruling. The gentleman may be right. I do not say that it is not so, but I do not recollect it. But even if it were so, that is nothing; it sheds no light upon this point of order, in my judgment.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. BERRY. I am interested in this proposition, and I desire to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will listen to the gentleman.

Mr. BERRY. In the Fifty-third Congress there was an appropriation of \$75,000 made for the construction of a building at Newport, Ky. The Government has only started the foundation at that point after a delay of six years, perhaps. Owing to the dilatory methods of the preceding Secretary of the Treasury nothing was done during his administration, or during the present Administration, I suppose from the fact that the office of the Secretary of the Treasury is overcharged with work. For if I have discovered anything in the six or seven years that I have been coming to Washington it is the fact that the Treasury Department has too much work to do. They take charge of the light-houses upon the seaboard; they take charge of the revenue cutters; they take charge of a dozen things with which the Treasury Department has really no business and which ought to be committed to some other department of the Government.

The lights on the seaboard and certain harbors and the Geodetic Survey belong to the Navy and ought to be attended to by the Navy Department. That is the reason why the Treasury Department does not have ample time to do the work which is submitted to it by Congress. Mr. Gage sent a person to Newport who was very incompetent, and they located upon a place that had been dug half way to China heretofore, and about 20 per cent perhaps of the cost of the building has been consumed in finding a foundation. The Secretary submitted the matter to an eminent engineer named Mr. Heuer, and Mr. Heuer sent somebody else, and he sent somebody else, to determine whether or not that was proper ground for the construction of the building, and they finally determined it was proper ground on which to construct the building.

A large part of the appropriation for the building has been consumed in finding a foundation upon ground that was improperly selected and by people who knew nothing about it. One of the consequences has been that while the building that was designed could have been built within the appropriation, the whole amount of which was \$75,000, they have now but \$62,000 left to construct the building. It could have been constructed within the appropriation, but owing to the rise in the price of material and labor that building has had to be curtailed until it will not be a respectable building for the United States.

They have taken off the glazed bricks with which it was intended to make it beautiful and make it a respectable building; and I think that this urgent deficiency bill is the proper place to include an appropriation of \$10,000 to make that building such as it was originally intended to be, and to make it creditable to our Government. I would like, therefore, that this point should not be sustained. Although not authorized by law, it is authorized by the necessity of the case, because it will enable the Government to erect a building that will be a credit to it. That is what I want done, and there are a number of other places in the same position.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment to the pending paragraph, to which the gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order that it is not in order because of the provisions of Rule XXI, section 2, which reads:

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress; nor shall any provision changing existing law be in order in any general appropriation bill or in any amendment thereto.

In the opinion of the Chair, following the precedents, the point of order must be sustained if the pending bill is a general appropriation bill. The gentleman from Missouri, however, urges that the pending bill is not a general appropriation bill, and therefore that section 2 of Rule XXI does not apply; and in support of his position he cites the introduction into the House on two previous occasions of deficiency appropriation bills that were admitted, according to the method then pursued, not to be general appropriation bills. In each of those cases, however, it will be observed that the subject-matter of the bill could have been covered in a single paragraph. In other words, the bill covered but a single subject, and it was beyond pretense that they could be regarded as general appropriation bills.

Mr. COWHERD. If the Chair will pardon me, I cited one instance where the bill covered the payment of clerks of the House, the payment of election expenses, and the payment of new clerks brought into the revenue department in connection with oleomargarine.

The CHAIRMAN. What the gentleman says may be true, but it is also true there was no pretense that the bills contained subject-matter relating to the Departments of the Government or a majority of the Departments of the Government. There is a vast distinction between the bills to which the gentleman refers and the bill before the House. This bill carries the sum of \$58,000,000. It deals with the executive department, the War Department, the Navy Department, the District of Columbia, and various other subjects. It is manifestly on its face a general bill, and in the opinion of the Chair must be so considered.

It is urged that the Committee on Appropriations can not

present more than one general appropriation bill under any particular heading. There is nothing, so far as the judgment of the Chair goes, to prevent the Committee on Appropriations from dividing their general appropriation bills in case of necessity for such action on their part. The reason for the adoption of Rule XXI, section 2, was to prevent general legislation upon appropriation bills, and there is no reason why Rule XXI should be applicable to any general appropriation bill that does not apply with equal force to the one that is now before the House.

Without undertaking to put the decision at all upon this proposition, the Chair suggests that it may be a question whether or not the point made by the gentleman from Missouri can now be entertained. This bill was introduced into the House as a general appropriation bill. The right to so introduce it was recognized as a privileged right; it was submitted to the Committee of the Whole as a general appropriation bill. No member rose in his place, either when the bill was presented or when it was committed to the Committee of the Whole House, to object that it was not a general appropriation bill, and it may very well be held that it is now too late to raise that question.

The House went into Committee of the Whole to consider it under the rules, and without placing the decision upon that ground at all, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would suggest to the Chair that at the time the bill was introduced all points of order were reserved, and it would include this point.

The CHAIRMAN. While that is true, this point of order should have been made in the House when the House resolved to go into Committee of the Whole to consider this bill.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

For rent of building now occupied by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing for storage and other purposes, at a rental of \$90 a month, \$720.

Mr. NORTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I think that this is an opportune moment to call the attention of the House to certain other conditions now existing, which seem to me ought to have consideration and given as much weight as the grave charges that have been brought against the Secretary of the Treasury.

We have, on this side of the House at least, ideas and opinions regarding the action of the Secretary, but we have been told, and of course are fully satisfied, that any facts, arguments, or illustrations we may bring can be decisively answered, in the language of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], by any Republican simply saying "it isn't so." [Laughter.]

We have the further assurance of my genial colleague from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] that all of our rights will be preserved and that we can be made perfectly happy if we will only come into the presence of the omnipotent Committee on Rules. With these most gratifying and generous assurances, I am content to remark that just at this present moment the New York bank scandal may rest in the background, as I hold in my hand, Mr. Chairman, another specimen of wrong and outrage. There is in this special case no vast amount of money involved, but it is an instance where an injustice has been done and a fraud perpetrated.

In the administration of the business affairs of a great nation like ours, those who are connected with such administration, and especially those who legislate for the general country, become accustomed to the consideration of large amounts. When we speak of millions on this floor no attention is paid to it, even if those millions are connected with fraudulent transactions on the part of high officials. It is true that when we charge specific acts, name the time, place, and amount, my esteemed friend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEBURN] rises to deny the charge, and the rosy red of indignation upon his brow, as he contemplates our temerity, is almost as sincere as his New York banker namesake when he wrote his famous, or notorious, letter to the honorable Secretary of the Treasury on their personal affairs; but this which I hold in my hands is a contract a small star-route subcontract, but it is a case of a specific act of wrong, outrage, combination, and conspiracy on the part of men who to-day hold contracts under this Government, men who are committing acts that if they were to commit in the ordinary course of business, and were drawn before the ordinary court of justice, would lead them to the penitentiary. And yet, when I go to the head of the great Post-Office Department, I am told that they are powerless, that they can not correct the wrong, that the remedy lies here with us, in Congress assembled, and that the Postmaster-General has appealed to us year after year and no action has been taken to provide a remedy.

He admits that under the star-route system, as now established by law, there has been continuous swindling, day after day and year after year.

In this special instance from my own district a contract was made, through fraudulent representations, in which it is required that a carrier shall travel over 6,000 miles per annum for the paltry sum of \$200. The agent of the contractor came, hunted up a boy 16 years of age, and by falsehood induced him to try to do

the work. To succeed, he wrote broadly across the margin of the copy of the contract given to the boy, "This contract is for six months," while in the body of the instrument it reads "for four years." Then when the six months had expired, by letters threatening the boy that if he throws up the job the Federal officers will arrest him and put him in prison, and his father, who is on his bond, will lose his little home, the agent compels the boy to continue. As I said, I appealed to the Postmaster-General, and was told that the Department could take no action, so I wrote the boy to quit.

I spoke to the gentleman having charge of the legislation affecting post-roads, and was told that he objected to any legislation in this direction, because it is the desire of the Department to control the star routes itself, but he preferred to have the work being done, as now, under the subcontract system. I am not condemning the action of the Department. I am trying to arouse this body to a realization of conditions that exist all over the country, and an evil which Congress alone can remedy.

It is well known to every member of this House that there exist star-route syndicates—"speculative bidders" is their official designation—who, according to the estimate of the Postmaster-General, secure a profit of nearly \$150,000 per year on subcontracts, to the detriment of the mail service.

I appeal to the members of this House, among whom there are at least one hundred who are cognizant of similar cases in their own district, to come to the relief of the Post-Office Department in this particular. Give it authority to act, so that the National Government may not continue to be, morally at least, if not legally, participes criminis in fraud and outrage. Let us enact some law that will enable the Postmaster-General to stop these scandals, which have been riotous in our mail service from the days of President Grant to the present hour, and which even now are worse than in the earlier days of star-route investigations.

I do not propose or care at this time to go more fully into details of the star-route system. It has been of a cancerous growth and is affecting our whole body politic. The time is now ripe, it seems to me, to make such change as will tend to its purification. While there are greater evils existing and questions of more profound moment, yet let not the righting of this one wrong be overshadowed and forgotten.

I hope that some time during this session we may have the opportunity, through the kindness and courtesy of the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads and the Committee on Rules, to take some decisive action on this question.

The Clerk read as follows:

MINTS AND ASSAY OFFICES.

For freight on bullion and coin, by registered mail or otherwise, between mints and assay offices, \$50,000.

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Chairman, on page 5 of this bill we find that there is a deficiency because of the "transportation of minor coin," and now we are on a provision at page 8 where a deficiency of \$50,000 appears for freight on bullion and coin.

A few weeks ago, on my way to San Francisco to bring back our gallant First Tennessee Regiment to their native heath, our party stopped at New Orleans. We were carried through the mint, and while I was there there drove up at least one and I think two heavily laden express wagons of the Adams or Southern Express Company, one or the other. I asked, "What is the immense load on the wagons?" The mint officer present in charge said it was silver bullion that was being brought from Philadelphia to be coined into money at the New Orleans mint. I said, "Do you mean to tell me that the United States Government is transporting for the purpose of mintage bullion from the mint at Philadelphia?"

He told me it was an everyday business and seemed to be very much surprised that such was the law and that such was the fact. He was not any more surprised than I was, because I remember only a few months back the Democratic party on the floor of this House opposed the closing of the mint at New Orleans, which the Republicans seemed to be determined upon, and it was only by a fierce fight that we saved it.

The Republicans undertook to shut up that mint because they said it was of no use, which we see is untrue. Mr. Chairman, is it possible that the silver bullion or the silver bars which come from what the Republican party seeks to call the unpatriotic States, "rotten boroughs" of the West—States which the Republican party, by the way, admitted into the Union and which they are now constantly denouncing because those States support the free coinage of silver—I say it is possible that this law is to be perpetuated for the transportation of bullion from the far West to Philadelphia and then transported to New Orleans for the purpose of coinage?

The Democrats fought to keep open this mint to avoid, among others, this very thing—this long haul from the West to the East, thence south to New Orleans—at the expense of the Government. Here is a deficit, Mr. Chairman, a deficit superinduced by hauling this bullion from the far West to the far East, that seems to want

everything or nothing, and then the transportation to almost the very last point on the southern shore of our country.

I am proud, Mr. Chairman, to have a chance to bring to the attention of this House and to exploit the record of my party on this question and to rehearse the illustrious reasons the Democratic party gave for keeping that mint open, which is turning out millions of dollars of silver money—showing it is necessary—helping us on in our patriotic aims at home and abroad. But I ask myself the question again to-day, as I did in New Orleans, is it possible that the Republican party can do anything in this country which is not done in the interests of trusts or railroads that perpetuate that party in power?

Why should the silver bullion be brought from the far West to Philadelphia and then sent to New Orleans for coinage? Why not send it from the West to New Orleans at first, as we suggested, thus saving time and money to the Government? But no. The railroads above the Ohio, operating from the West to the East, must have a chance and get it. They have a "pull" with the Republicans, and hence get to haul this freight, first East to the mint, then their Atlantic and Gulf allies finish up the "job" by hauling it to the far South, and the Government foots the bill—a deficit which we are now considering. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT.

For continuing the employment during the three months beginning April 1, 1900, of such additional temporary force of clerks, messengers, laborers, and other assistants as in the judgment of the Secretary of War may be proper and necessary to the prompt, efficient, and accurate dispatch of official business in the War Department and its bureaus, to be allotted by the Secretary of War to such bureaus and offices as the exigencies of the needs of the service may demand, \$150,000. Persons in the classified service of the Government shall not be eligible to appointment under this appropriation, or to be transferred from any position in the classified service to positions paid hereunder.

For postage stamps for the War Department and its bureaus, as required under the Postal Union, to prepay postage on matters addressed to Postal Union countries, \$500.

During the reading of the foregoing, Mr. LLOYD rose and addressed the Chair.

Mr. RIXEY. I desire to offer an amendment to the concluding portion of the paragraph just passed. I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out, after the word "dollars," in line 22, page 11, the residue of the paragraph and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Appointments under this appropriation shall be made in compliance with existing law."

Mr. CANNON. I reserve the point of order; in fact, make the point of order, first, that that paragraph has been passed, and second, that this is in compliance with existing law for this temporary force. I will say to the gentleman that there was the same provision last year, and for nine months this year, and this continues the status of this temporary force for the remaining three months of the year. For both reasons it seems to me the amendment is not in order.

Mr. RIXEY. As I understand, Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. One moment. What does the gentleman from Virginia have to say to the first objection that is made, that the paragraph had been passed.

Mr. RIXEY. I have this to say: I intended to offer that amendment to this paragraph, but before the Clerk had concluded the reading of the paragraph the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] was upon his feet addressing the Chair. It was my intention to offer the amendment as soon as I could get the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. RIXEY. As I understand the paragraph, Mr. Chairman, it places the sum of \$150,000 at the disposal of the Secretary of War for the employment of clerks and other employees of the Government. I am not here to defend the civil-service law, and I would be perfectly willing to let this paragraph stand, provided we could have any assurance that the money would be disbursed in a fair way to both sides.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Will the gentleman permit me a moment?

Mr. RIXEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. This is for temporary clerks, who were employed only about a year ago; and if the gentleman will look at the hearings before the committee, he will find that it is shown that they are equally efficient with those who might be supplied through the classified service. This is for the purpose of continuing them for three months longer. There can be no harm in continuing for twelve months clerks who are equally as proficient and perhaps more efficient than those that may be secured through the civil service.

Mr. RIXEY. Will the gentleman now answer me a question?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes.

Mr. RIXEY. Under this provision can not the Secretary of War appoint additional clerks?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If he needs them.

Mr. RIXEY. Certainly. I do not deny he can get as good clerks out of the civil service as he can get through that service, but what I contend is, we have a law upon the subject and we

ought to follow it. I see no reason why we should place \$150,000 at the disposal of the Secretary of War, who will naturally use it for the appointment of clerks, chiefly the friends of his own political party.

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. RIXEY. Certainly.

Mr. HULL. The amount of the appropriation for the temporary clerks heretofore is larger than this amount. The force has been organized since the breaking out of the war by the appointment of temporary clerks only. That force is being largely reduced from month to month, and this appropriation is much smaller than if the original number had been kept. Now, then, if you put them in the classified service, how are you going to get rid of them? They are temporary clerks; and if you put them in the classified service, you will have to find work for them or pass a law to reduce the number.

Mr. RIXEY. Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned, I am not particularly enamored of the civil service; but I would like to have some assurance that the appointments of these men will not be made in a partisan way.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I do not think they have been made in a partisan sense. I can not say what proportion of Republicans or Democrats have been appointed under the Secretary of War; but I know a great many Democrats are employed on the temporary roll, and I know they are being dropped as they can be disposed of from day to day and month to month. The roll is being lessened all the while and no new men put on; but if an emergency should come up owing to the situation in the Philippine Islands, under this bill he can appoint them, and he ought to appoint them. Now you know the facts, and you can take one horn of the dilemma or the other. You have got to give him the right to get them through the civil service and do this work, or do this work as he has been doing it and take men from the outside.

Mr. LENTZ. Will the gentleman from Georgia allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Certainly.

Mr. LENTZ. Do you know of any Democrats from any Northern State that have been appointed?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I believe that there is a very much larger number from your State than any other. [Laughter.]

Mr. LENTZ. I do not believe there is a Democrat from my State on that roll.

Mr. RIXEY. While I have no doubt the gentleman from Georgia has had a fair share of the appointments, what I am after is to get a fair share of the appointments for myself. [Laughter.]

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I wish to say to the gentleman that if there is anything I can do for him at the War Department, it will be done.

Mr. RIXEY. With that assurance, I think I might very well withdraw my amendment. [Laughter.]

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him another question?

Mr. RIXEY. Certainly.

Mr. HULL. I desire to ask the gentleman now, as he has withdrawn his amendment—

Mr. RIXEY. I would like to test my friend in a direct way before I withdraw it.

Mr. HULL. If the gentleman will yield, I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Of the 42,000 that were put under the civil service by President Cleveland before he went out of office, how many were Republicans?

Mr. RIXEY. I can not tell you, and I do not think you can.

Mr. HULL. My understanding is there was none.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I want to say candidly to my friend that I was informed by the officials that the question of Democracy or Republicanism or Populism had not entered into consideration in the appointments of these temporary clerks. This I do know, there are a good many Democrats there.

Mr. RIXEY. It seems to me perfectly fair to all parties that, as we have a law regulating these appointments, it should be followed. I do not see any reason why we should make an exception in this case and place \$150,000 under the control of any member of the Government, to be used in making appointments as he sees proper. I say it is perfectly natural that the Secretary of War, a Republican, in a Republican Administration, with \$150,000 with which he can give employment, should give the preference to people of his own political party.

I should say here the Democratic party would do the same thing. I do not believe that the Secretary of War in making these appointments will make them irrespective of their political preferences. If my friend wants to do away with the civil-service law, I may be with him; and if he can give me assurances upon which I can rely that political views will make no difference in the selection of these clerks I will be satisfied.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment is not in order. I think we passed that provision and I think my point of order is good.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman from

Illinois that when the gentleman from Virginia says that he was on his feet ready to take the point of order the Chair does not feel disposed to take advantage of the fact that two or three lines beyond that were read.

Mr. CANNON. Does the Chair hold that it is in time?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is disposed to hold that the amendment was offered in time.

Mr. CANNON. Well, the easiest way is to vote on it, and I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois withdraw his point of order?

Mr. CANNON. No; I understood the Chair to overrule the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overruled the portion that related to the time.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I ask for the reading of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. CANNON. That changes existing law, Mr. Chairman, beyond question. The object of this legislation—and it is already the law that persons in the classified service of the Government shall not be eligible to appointment under this appropriation, or to be transferred from any position in the classified service to a position made thereunder. Now, that law was enacted a year ago, and enacted under legislative and executive appropriation, in connection with the appropriation for this identical temporary force. The object of the enactment of that law we have repeated here was to cure an abuse that existed in the Department, namely, that from this temporary appropriation, that was intended to be temporary in its nature to meet the war exigencies, the Department had in many cases transferred \$1,200, \$1,400, and \$1,600 clerks in the classified service under this rule and promoted them. Now, then, it was the sense of Congress at that time to cure that abuse; and this legislation, in these identical words, was had during the last session of Congress in connection with this temporary force. Now we come to make a deficiency appropriation for this temporary force containing the law as it is, still keeping it out of the power to make this detail from the classified service. If the gentleman's amendment is adopted it changes the law, and you can go on and detail from that classified service \$1,200 clerks and promote them to \$1,800 clerks.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois if, in his judgment, without the insertion of these lines in the paragraph, that would be the law?

Mr. CANNON. Undoubtedly; these lines but repeat the law that was enacted last winter, and the striking out of these lines and inserting the gentleman's provision changes the law. It strikes out existing law and introduces a new provision.

Mr. RIXEY. Why, in the paragraph providing for this appropriation, do you insert the latter part of the paragraph at all?

Mr. CANNON. Out of abundant caution we repeat the parent law. It is often done, and in fact it is done all through this bill, in almost every item.

Mr. RIXEY. The amendment that I propose states that this appropriation for the employment shall be in compliance with existing law. How can you contend that a provision of that kind is contradictory of existing law and changes existing law?

Mr. CANNON. It repeals existing law.

Mr. RIXEY. I can not see how that is when it is in compliance with existing law.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman strikes out these lines and his provision is inserted, then the evil is possible that Congress attempted to remedy at the last session.

The CHAIRMAN. Upon the ground that this is simply a reenactment of existing law, the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, reads as follows:

Vicksburg National Military Park: For such engineering and topographical work in connection with the Vicksburg National Military Park as may be proper and necessary, and for the payment of salaries and clerical expenses and such other incidental expenses as are provided for in the act of February 21, 1899, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the sum of \$5,000, or so much of said amount as may be necessary, may be expended, with the approval of the Secretary of War, in the purchase of lands to be used as a part of the site of said park, \$20,000.

Mr. COUSINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 13, in line 10, after the word "war," insert "in addition to the amount authorized by section 1 of the act approved February 21, 1899."

Mr. COUSINS. I think that will commend itself to the judgment of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CANNON. I will say that this embodies beyond question what the committee intended to report. I think it does not change it, but there can be no question about it with the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, let the amendment be read again.

The amendment was again read.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For construction of balloon house and administration and instruction building at the Signal Corps post, at Fort Myer, Va., \$18,500.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if this is not new legislation?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no. You mean in reference to Fort Myer?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. No; it is not.

Mr. LLOYD. It provides for the construction of a balloon house. Is there any balloon house there now?

Mr. CANNON. No; but there is a fort there.

Mr. LLOYD. Is there any balloon house authorized by law at the present time?

Mr. CANNON. This is a public work in progress.

Mr. LLOYD. I understood you that there was no balloon house there.

Mr. CANNON. But the fort is there; the barracks and quarters are there. The signal office is there, and this is a mere incident to enable the Signal Service to properly conduct its educational work. We had a very full hearing about it. But the rule does not require, under conditions of that kind, and estimates, that there should be separate legislative action before you can build an outhouse or before you can construct a building as an incident to the work.

Mr. LLOYD. I should like to inquire what is the necessity for this expenditure?

Mr. CANNON. Well, the necessity for the expenditure is stated at length in the hearings. It is this: The Signal Service, since the commencement of the war with Spain, has very greatly increased, and it is almost impossible to get efficient signal-service men or minor officers except as they are enlisted and educated. For instance, take telegraph operators and the various signal-service men. They command better salaries elsewhere, and it has been found necessary, here at Fort Myer, to concentrate the enlisted men and let them go into a school of instruction. That covers ballooning, it covers telegraphy, it covers the code of signals, and many other things that I do not know about.

Mr. LLOYD. Is ballooning taught in any other place in the military department?

Mr. CANNON. No; they formerly taught it somewhat at the Presidio, and perhaps at some other point, but it has been concentrated at Fort Myer.

Mr. LLOYD. Is it so urgently necessary that we teach ballooning in the military establishment of the United States Government that upon an urgent deficiency bill we should make an appropriation of \$18,500 for it?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, well, this is an urgent deficiency bill. It is wider than that. It is a bill for the public service, substantially, for the remainder of this fiscal year, and has gathered many items into it that are not urgent, some which might wait, but all necessary during the fiscal year. But as to this particular item, the sooner the appropriation is made the sooner the necessary improvement will be made.

Mr. LLOYD. I understood the distinguished gentleman, with reference to the amendment that was sought to be offered by which the post-office building in Kansas City might be completed, to object on the ground that it was new legislation. It seems to me certainly that was nothing like as new legislation as this would be.

Mr. CANNON. I will say to my friend that the distinction is right here, so that I think my friend will see it at once: In the case of Kansas City, the law that authorized the erection of a public building there expressly provided that it should not exceed a certain limit of cost. Now, all the money within that limit has been appropriated. The law in reference to Fort Myer, the Presidio, Fortress Monroe, and other military posts in the United States, did not fix a limitation, and can not, in the nature of things, fix a limitation, and they are public works that come within clause 2 of Rule XXI, relating to works in progress.

Mr. LLOYD. Is not this the distinction: At Kansas City there was an appropriation made for a post-office building, and the amount appropriated has been expended; here it is sought to create a new enterprise, to build a balloon house and to teach a system of ballooning, which has not been taught under the United States Government?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no.

Mr. LLOYD. One is an appropriation in aid of an enterprise upon which money has been expended, the other is to make an appropriation, as I understand it, for something that has never been undertaken and is entirely a new enterprise.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no. I will state it again. At Kansas City there was a certain limit, and that limit is exhausted.

Mr. LLOYD. In this case there is no limit.

Mr. CANNON. Under the law here there is no limit. It is a public work in progress, and the appropriation is, in my judgment and in the judgment of your committee, in order, it being a public work in progress and part and parcel of the military establishment. But if the gentleman desires to make the point of order against it, I hope he will make it and let the Chair pass upon it.

Mr. LLOYD. I am not disposed to make the point of order, but I am merely calling attention to the fact that here you are undertaking an entirely new enterprise, when objection was made in the case of the Kansas City post-office to an enterprise already under way and necessary to be constructed.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, well, the evidence shows that they have got \$15,000 worth of balloons over there at Fort Myer, and that this school of instruction is established. Now, I am quite content to let the committee pass upon the criticism of the gentleman. I hope the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of enlisted men, \$3,000,197,149.

Mr. SULZER. I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. CANNON. In line 10, page 15?

Mr. SULZER. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, during my absence from the House this afternoon I am informed that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] sent to the Clerk's desk and had read a part of an editorial from the Greenville, S. C., Daily News of Thursday, January 11, 1900, criticising the New York Journal, the New York World, and myself regarding the investigation of Secretary Lyman J. Gage, of the Treasury Department.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will allow me, how much time does the gentleman require?

Mr. SULZER. Only a moment or two.

Mr. CANNON. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have not to exceed five minutes.

Mr. SULZER. I have the floor and it will only take a moment or two.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman's discussion is out of order. Therefore, as I gave notice that I would enforce the rule, I acknowledge the equity of the gentleman having an opportunity to reply and I hope there will be unanimous consent.

Mr. SULZER. Well, I hear no objection. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the gentleman from New York have five minutes. Is their objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SULZER. I have read over the part of the editorial which has been put in the RECORD, and in justice to myself I want to say a few words in regard to it.

During the time that I have been a member of this House I have never sent to the Clerk's desk a newspaper clipping criticising a colleague, and I hope I never will. Whatever I have to say I have the courage to say myself and on my own responsibility. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] did not have the courage to say on his own responsibility what this editorial alleges. He took a mean advantage to hide himself behind a newspaper clipping. The article is written by an entire stranger to me. I never saw him; I do not know him; I never heard of him, and, so far as I know, I never did him an injury in my life.

I realize, Mr. Chairman, that my public acts and my public utterances are the subject of legitimate criticism by the newspapers of this country. I have made it a rule of my life never to deny anything about myself that appears in the newspapers, whether it is good, bad, or indifferent. Life is too short to do so, and a newspaper lie travels so fast that the truth seldom overtakes it, and if it does it is too late to do any good.

I am informed by a colleague that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS], when he sent this editorial to the desk, made the deliberate assertion that it was from a Democratic newspaper and that the editor was a Democrat. I am informed by my colleague from South Carolina that the Greenville Daily News is not a Democratic newspaper and that the editor is not a Democrat. From the tone of the editorial it would seem to me that the man who wrote it is a Republican of the Hanna stripe.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. He was a Democrat before he sold out.

Mr. SULZER. Yes, I am informed so. And his abuse of me is the very best praise I can have for doing my duty and telling the truth about the iniquity of the Republican party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I am informed that the editor and his newspaper supported the Republican party in 1896, and that he has been vociferously shouting for the Republican party ever since. That contemptible editorial would seem to bear this out. Prior to 1896, I am informed and believe, the editor and his newspaper were Democratic, but in that memorable year it is said the editor sold his political principles and political convictions for a mess of pottage to MARK HANNA, and his paper is now and ever since has been a Hannaized and a subsidized sheet. The paper is now employed, it is said, by HANNA and other Republicans to abuse loyal, honest, and conscientious Democrats.

Let me say right here that this abuse of me is very high praise, coming from the source it does. I have the courage to do my duty, and will continue to do it and to tell the truth about the iniquity of the Republican party. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I will do this to the best of my ability, notwithstanding

slandrous and hypocritical criticisms from subsidized sheets in the interests of MARK HANNA and the Republican party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I am a Democrat, and I stand by my party. I believe in its principles and will do my best to voice them and to vindicate them. I have the courage of my political convictions and dare to express them. I know that the Republicans hate me for telling the truth, and I know that I am abused all over the country—ridiculed and maligned—because I dare to stand up here and in the city of New York, in the very heart of plutocracy, and tell the truth regarding great financial and economic questions.

HANNA and his cohorts, however, with all their power and with all their money, have not been able to defeat me. My constituents know me and they believe in me. They elected me five times to the legislature of my State, and they have elected me three times to Congress, and every time by an increased majority. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In 1894 I carried my district by a little over 800 majority. In 1896 I carried it by over 1,800 majority, and in 1898 I carried it by over 8,000 majority [loud applause on the Democratic side], and ran over 3,000 votes ahead of the ticket. The record speaks for itself, and is the people's commendation of my public career. The editorial is beneath my contempt, and I will not dignify it by talking about it or myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SULZER. Just a few moments more. Let me say now that I shall continue to do my duty as I see it, and tell the truth regarding matters of public moment. MARK HANNA and his hirelings, the agents of the trusts, and the plutocrats can not frighten me, can not intimidate me, and can not prevent me from voicing the sentiments of the people; and I know the people pay very little attention to ridiculous and scurrilous articles written about public men by insignificant and irresponsible persons. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I have no controversy with the man who wrote the article. He is entitled to his opinion of me. My controversy is with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS]. I believe he will regret the action he has taken to-day. When he deliberately declared the newspaper and the editor belonged to the Democratic party he stated what was not true. I say here and now, on information given me by Representatives from South Carolina, that that statement is absolutely untrue, and if the gentleman had taken the trouble to inform himself about it he would not have made the reckless statement he did. He should be more careful hereafter.

The editorial also reflects on the New York Journal and the New York World. They are great newspapers, conducted in the interest of the people, and they will and can take care of themselves. They need no eulogy from me or any other man. Let me say, however, that MARK HANNA and the Republican party never had money enough, and never will have money enough, to buy them, or either of them. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

And you will find both of them supporting the Democratic party and the Democratic candidate for President in the next political contest. They stand for the common weal, they fight the battle of the plain people, and they can not be intimidated or swerved from the path of duty. In the interest of truth and publicity they will unearth the scandals of the Treasury Department and expose to the world Republican iniquity in high places, notwithstanding the Greenville News or the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS]. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, a single word. If that speech is not good for the nomination for the Vice-Presidency of you Democrats, then you are a very ungrateful set. [General laughter.] I hope the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Transportation of the Army and its supplies: For transportation of the Army, including baggage of the troops when moving either by land or water, and including also the transportation of recruits and recruiting parties heretofore paid from the appropriation for "Expenses for recruiting;" of supplies to the militia furnished by the War Department; of the necessary agents and employees; of clothing, camp and garrison equipage, and other quartermaster stores, from Army depots or places of purchase or delivery to the several posts and Army depots, and from those depots to the troops in the field; of horse equipments and subsistence stores from the places of purchase, and from the places of delivery under contract to such places as the circumstances of the service may require them to be sent; of ordnance, ordnance stores, and small arms from the foundries and armories to the arsenals, fortifications, frontier posts, and Army depots; freights, wharfage, tolls, and ferriages; the purchase and hire of draft and pack animals and harness, and the purchase and repair of wagons, carts, and drays, and of ships and other seagoing vessels and boats required for the transportation of supplies and for garrison purposes; for drayage and cartage at the several posts; hire of teamsters and other employees; transportation of funds of the Army; the expenses of sailing public transports on the various rivers, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Atlantic and Pacific oceans; for procuring water, and introducing the same to buildings, at such posts as from their situation require it to be brought from a distance, and for the disposal of sewage and drainage, and for constructing roads and wharves; including not exceeding \$750,000 for transportation of Spanish prisoners held by the United States and by the insurgents in the Philippine Islands from those islands to Spain, as provided by the treaty of Paris; for the payment of Army transportations lawfully due

such land-grant railroads as have not received aid in Government bonds (to be adjusted in accordance with the decisions of the Supreme Court in cases decided under such land-grant acts), but in no case shall more than 50 per cent of full amount of service be paid: *Provided*, That such compensation shall be computed upon the basis of the tariff or lower special rates for like transportation performed for the public at large, and shall be accepted as in full for all demands for such service: *Provided further*, That in expending the money appropriated by this act, a railroad company which has not received aid in bonds of the United States, and which obtained a grant of public land to aid in the construction of its railroad on condition that such railroad should be a post route and military road, subject to the use of the United States for postal, military, naval, and other Government services, and also subject to such regulations as Congress may impose restricting the charge for such Government transportation, having claims against the United States for transportation of troops and munitions of war and military supplies and property over such aided railroads, shall be paid out of the moneys appropriated by the foregoing provision only on the basis of such rate for the transportation of such troops and munitions of war and military supplies and property as the Secretary of War shall deem just and reasonable under the foregoing provision, such rate not to exceed 50 per cent of the compensation for such Government transportation as shall at the time be charged to and paid by private parties to any such company for like and similar transportation; and the amount so fixed to be paid shall be accepted as in full for all demands for such service, \$30,750,000.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations how much there is contained in this urgent deficiency bill in excess of the ordinary appropriations for military purposes?

Mr. CANNON. Well, I will say to the gentleman, for transportation, which item we are now upon—

Mr. TERRY. The military department generally.

Mr. CANNON. I will get the gentleman the report in a moment. The report shows that there is reappropriated for the military establishment \$45,752,000.

Mr. TERRY. In this bill?

Mr. CANNON. In this bill, reappropriated.

Mr. TERRY. How much is that over the usual appropriation as appropriated heretofore?

Mr. CANNON. Not nearly as much as we had a year ago.

Mr. TERRY. That was when we were engaged in a war authorized by Congress, and not one initiated and conducted without the direct approval of the representatives of the people.

Mr. CANNON. We had over a hundred million a year ago.

Mr. TERRY. That was to carry on a war that Congress authorized in favor of freedom for Cuba. Now I want to see how much we are to expend for the Administration war.

Mr. CANNON. The Army appropriation for the current year, in round numbers, reported and enacted under the lead of the Committee on Military Affairs, is \$80,000,000. Now, then, this appropriation for the Army makes available \$45,000,000 from balances heretofore appropriated, last year, and not expended. Now, if you will add \$45,000,000 to the \$80,000,000—

Mr. TERRY. That makes one hundred and twenty-odd millions—

Mr. CANNON. Yes; one hundred and twenty-five millions.

Mr. TERRY (continuing). To carry on this Administration and political war.

Mr. CANNON. Oh!

Mr. TERRY (continuing). Waged outside of the Constitution. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CANNON. Oh!

Mr. TERRY. I know that you say "No;" but the people of the country do not say "No."

Mr. CANNON. To support the Army, to uphold the flag, to enforce the law, to suppress insurrection. [Applause on the Republican side.] That is what it is, and I will stake my individual political fortunes and those of my party upon the indorsement of the American people; and if you dare stake yours upon a repudiation of that policy, well, you can stake it and go on.

Mr. TERRY. I dare to say this, that in respect to this war that is now being waged, and whilst we deplore the way we got into it, my people are willing to support the flag. But they condemn the policy that put the flag there in a war of criminal aggression when it ought not to have been placed there in such a cause. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We condemn the policy that is forcing us into an un-American position in order to support the flag.

Let me tell you if Congress or this Administration would declare its policy, as it declared in the case of Cuba, the insurrectionists, as you call them, would lay down their arms in less than two weeks and end this criminal war. This is a criminal war and is going on because you did not declare what your policy and purposes were to be; and yet when you have entered upon such a partisan course you try to divert public attention by wrapping yourselves up in the flag and crying out about "patriotism," as you do every time you seek to depart from the fundamental principles of the American Government. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CANNON. One word only in reply. This bill appropriates \$45,000,000 to sustain the Army for the balance of this fiscal year. If anybody wants to move to strike the appropriation out, here is the place and now is the time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CANNON. Let me complete my sentence.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. You have issued a challenge.

Mr. CANNON. Now is the time and here is the place. So far as disturbing the air is concerned, criticism and declamation that do not affect the legislation concern me but little. We used to have an old saying that the court decided, the judgment was entered, and the party that lost had one remedy—he could stand and swear at the court. [Laughter.]

Now, I do not desire upon this bill, at this time, under the five-minute rule, so far as I am concerned, to enter upon a discussion of the policy touching our outlying territory; there is a time to do that; but I stand ready to oppose any motion that comes from anywhere that will decrease this appropriation one cent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I ask the gentleman from Illinois to yield to me.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. May I interrupt the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I presume that there is not an American citizen anywhere, upon either side of this Chamber or outside of this Chamber, who is worthy of mention as an American citizen, who wants to be disloyal to the flag or to the cause of his country in war. The gentleman from Illinois, with his accustomed shrewdness and cunning, has uttered a challenge which he knows will not be accepted, because he knows that there is not a man on the Democratic side of this Chamber, however violently opposed to the present imperialistic policy of the Administration, who will undertake to weaken the arm of an American soldier while he is fighting, whether the foe is right or whether the foe is wrong, whether the foe is fighting for liberty in reality or for liberty in imagination. I believe that these people out there in the Philippines are fighting for liberty in reality; but when my country declares war and I am called upon to line myself up upon the one side or the other, I have never yet proposed to decrease the amount of money, the number of guns, or the number of soldiers that are necessary to carry out that policy.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me go a step further. The gentleman from Illinois has uttered his challenge safely, because with his accustomed shrewdness and cunning he has put it on a safe ground. I am tired, in the words of Professor McLaughlin, of Chicago, a time-honored Republican, I believe—I am tired of the miserable subterfuges whereby it is attempted to confuse loyalty to the flag with loyalty to a policy that disgraces the flag. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, if it were once uttered as a fundamental principle of patriotism that no man could remain a patriot and at the same time oppose the methods of the Administration, either in inaugurating or carrying on war, what then would become of civilization? What of humanity? What would become, sir, of the Government that we have attempted to establish in this country? What would become of Burke, of Chatham, and all the great men who never refused to vote supplies for the British army while it was attempting to subjugate our ancestors, but who did stand in the House of Commons day after day and night after night and enter their protests within the nation, but not outside of it, against the policy which was carrying the nation's flag in a wrong cause?

Ah, Mr. Chairman, this world is an old world and it has an old history, a history that repeats itself all the time, and the history of all the nations is summed up in one sentence, as some great man, whose name I have forgotten, has said, "First liberty, then glory, then splendor, then corruption, and then decay, and barbarism at last."

Mr. BELL and other members. Byron.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I fear we have a people who are forgetting that a free country, the Government of a free people, was established for the purpose of rendering the individual citizen free and happy, and beginning to believe that government was established for the purpose of rendering the Government itself splendid or the flag glorious. Such a people are upon the very first rung of the ladder in their descent, and I defy the gentleman from Illinois and I defy anybody within the length and breadth of the United States to pursue the history of any people anywhere who have started out with devotion to liberty and have wound up with devotion to glory that have not gone down to death and barbarism.

There is a glory that is glory indeed. There is a glory of the flag that is glory indeed, and that is carrying it as the emblem of all that is precious, of all that is free, of all that is right, of all that is just. But there is a pseudo glory that is glory for the time being. Its advocates may seemingly press into the service for the time being those who do not believe in its ultimate results nor in its ultimate intents. But it is none the less a pseudo and a false glory, and that is the worship of the flag simply because it is a flag, because the flag is there, regardless of whether it ought to be there, regardless of whether the cause of liberty,

humanity, civilization, justice, and righteousness demand that it should be there or not.

Now, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that in my opinion there will not be a vote upon this side against all the guns and all the men and all the ammunition that are needed, because, although we have terms to make with the Filipinos, terms, I hope, besides unconditional surrender, those terms are not to be made until peace is established. Just one word more. I do not intend to weary the House. I did not even intend to say what I am saying now; had not the remotest idea of it.

Some time ago I introduced some resolutions into this House, expressing at least my own opinion of what we ought to do, and in this one sentence I will round it out: First, accomplish peace. Before we do that, however, announce to the civilized world and to the Filipinos what our policy will be with regard to the Filipinos and their territory. This is my challenge, our challenge, to the gentleman from Illinois. I believe with the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY], that if we announce that policy we will have peace within two years. But do not execute that policy, do not consummate that policy, until peace is established. And then when peace is established, let the great American Republic—the great Republic of all the ages and of all the world—declare to these brown men, half clad and half civilized, this policy: "For a limited length of time we will stand by you while you learn how to stand up. At the expiration of that time we will leave you your liberty, your independence, your autonomy, provided only that you enter into treaty to do what is just and right by us in consideration of what we have accomplished for you, namely, this, your proposed liberty and independence." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I will take a very brief time to say a word or two. I did not have any supposition that remarks of the kind that have been made were to be made. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY] arose in his place while we were considering a money bill to provide for the support of the Army and proceeded to interrogate the gentleman in charge of the bill. I answered his question as well as I could. He then, in substance, said that this was money by the one hundred and twenty-five millions of dollars to carry on a political war, if not a wicked war, etc.

And, as I am apt to do in the heat of conversation, having charge of the bill, I answered; and then the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] comes and makes a splendid talk, as he always does, an absolute oration to liberty, to justice, to law, to order, and he refers to the rocks upon which ancient governments and civilizations have split, and all that kind of thing. It was done as well, I will say to my honored friend from Mississippi, as I ever heard anybody do it before in the House or out of the House. I want to compliment the gentleman.

But, after all said and done, what is this bill? It is a bill taking money from the Treasury to support the Army, which is used in the enforcing of law and the putting down of insurrection. What is the practical question? Shall the money be appropriated or not? That is the only practical question. If it is to be appropriated at all, then the sooner it is appropriated and the more directly it is expended to the end in view, with the least confusion of counsel, the better—the better for saving life, the better for the Filipinos, the better for the Americans, the better for the enforcement of law.

And pending that time the more of a unit we can be in voting this money, and the more of a unit we can be in supporting this policy—if we are to enforce law and order and to put down the insurrection, the more of a unit we can be the better. Now, that is all that I aim to say. But the gentleman says that with my cunning I have defied anybody to move to strike out a dollar of this appropriation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Declare your policy. That is what we want.

Mr. CANNON. The policy, here and now, that I am addressing myself to is to appropriate the money to support the Army that will put down the insurrection. Now, if you are not for it, vote against it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. We are with you on that.

Mr. CANNON. If you are for it, vote for it. "But," says my friend, "some time or other, in the distant future, I expect to criticise the method in which these affairs have been carried on." And then he says we should declare a policy, and so on. Well, I have always found it safe, out in the Mississippi Valley, not to cross a stream until you come to it.

Therefore I am not here to say exactly what legislation shall be had in the future, when we come to make a civil establishment for the Philippine Islands, because, forsooth, the circumstances and conditions may change, so that the exact remedy, determined now for a year hence, or six months hence, or two years hence, might not be apt.

Now, one single word as to the propriety of saying by word in

this great legislative body, or by word in the great metropolitan press, or by word in the great meetings throughout the country, that which will encourage the enemy. You all recollect that Aguinaldo during last fall, before the election, issued that proclamation asking his people to stand firm and resist the Army of the United States, because, he said, the election was coming on over there and there would be a reversal of policy.

Now, thank God, I never have said anything, while I was voting for the Army or otherwise, that authorized Aguinaldo to make such a proclamation as that. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. TERRY. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois—

Mr. CANNON. I can not yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. CANNON. Ordinarily I yield to my distinguished friend, but just at this moment I can not. Now, that is all I want to say. I have no desire to criticize the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY] nor the honorable gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. They are Representatives; they are of full age; they are answerable to their constituents. But when they criticize me, I must at least defend the measure that I have in hand, and I would have them with me, at least for the present, if I had supreme power, not only in voting for this bill, but in withholding counsel that would make \$2 necessary to put down the insurrection in the Philippines instead of \$1. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That is just exactly what Lord North said to Edmund Burke.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, but I will say to the gentleman I was not there at that time. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. But history was there, and history is eternal.

The Clerk read as follows:

For repairing and preserving ordnance and ordnance stores in the hands of troops, and for issue at the arsenals and depots, \$30,000.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after line 3, page 26, the following:

"The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to deliver to the order of J. H. Wood, chairman of the general committee of the Thirty-fourth National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, to be held at Chicago next summer, two dismounted condemned cannon, used in the late civil war, to be used for the purpose of furnishing memorial badges commemorative of the holding of such encampment: *Provided*, That no expense shall be caused to the United States for the delivery of said condemned cannon."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, this is the usual provision that is made from year to year with reference to the annual meeting of the Grand Army, and I am inclined, so far as I am concerned, to accept the amendment.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For experimental rural free delivery, including pay of carriers, horse-hire allowance, supplies, and mechanical appliances, \$150,000: *Provided*, That in administering the service under this appropriation no deficiency shall be created therein.

Mr. GRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend page 39, line 6, by striking out the proviso in lines 6, 7, and 8.

Mr. CANNON. Now, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will allow me, as that is already the law, this does not change it. To save time, as I want to complete this bill to-night, so far as I am concerned, the amendment may be adopted.

Mr. GRIGGS. That is satisfactory to me, Mr. Chairman.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BENTON. I have an amendment to offer to this section.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out, in line 6, on page 39, the words "and fifty."

Mr. BENTON. I want it understood that in offering this amendment I am not opposed to rural free delivery. I am willing to vote all the money necessary for its maintenance. I am striking at a wrong that has been done with the money already appropriated by Congress. There was appropriated \$300,000 at the last Congress for rural free delivery. After several months passed, establishing routes in some districts stopped, because the Assistant Postmaster-General said the appropriation was exhausted, and we find now that the Department has spent \$25,000 more than was permissible for the half year of that time. It is argued by some gentlemen here that this appropriation is intended to be spent by the Postmaster-General as he pleases and that he could spend the whole sum in a month in experiment. That is not the language of the act under which it was appropriated. That act says:

Appropriations for the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900.

What I claim is that the Post-Office Department, at the behest or request of members of Congress, has gone beyond the appropriation and has spent \$25,000 more than they were authorized to spend for the six months. I say it is all right for men in Congress

to importune the Department, but those in charge of rural free delivery should have told them, as I was told, that the money was exhausted and not have been persuaded to violate the law. The precedent is evil. Permit the executive officer to go beyond the authority granted by Congress and come in and ask for money to make up a deficiency and get it, and the door is opened for a repetition of the same thing. It is all right for Congressmen to beg for these routes to be established who want this rural free delivery. I am for rural delivery myself, but I say this question goes beyond that. It is fundamental that our executive officer should be bound by the specific appropriation, and whatever gentlemen on the other side may do, I say it is wrong to go beyond it.

I was sorry and surprised to find that the chairman of the committee, after condemning this policy as strongly as I did, closed up his speech with the declaration that he would vote for the bill notwithstanding he knew a wrong had been committed. What I want to call the attention of the House to is that we on this side of the House have always prided ourselves as being strict constructionists, both of the law and the Constitution; and I want to know whether Democrats are going to permit themselves to indorse the acts of any official in violation of law because such violation may benefit their districts?

This rural delivery depends upon a particular act of Congress. The life and virility of this rural delivery depends upon the specific act which appropriated the \$300,000. You are asked to indorse the executive act of going beyond the amount permitted, and what I want to know is whether men on this side of the House, because they may be able to get an extra route, are going to indorse the action of the Department, which was openly and notoriously in violation of law.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I would like to ask the gentleman if this is not the situation: Routes have been organized which, unless this appropriation is continued, will be suspended?

Mr. BENTON. Yes; it would suspend those established within the last few weeks. I know the claim has been made here a half a dozen times that it would suspend them all, but it is not true. I know there is a clamor for these free-delivery routes, but I shall insist on this question being voted upon, so that Democrats who want to vote according to law can stand up, and those who want to be counted as violating the law can have the opportunity.

It is an unfair construction of the law to say that the Post-Office Department could have expended the whole sum in six months or in one month. This appropriation was for the whole fiscal year. When the half of the sum appropriated was exhausted in the half year, other members should have been told, as I was, that no more money was available till appropriated. Then the Department could come to Congress and say, "We need \$150,000 to establish and maintain new routes for the remainder of the fiscal year." Under the Constitution Congress is invested with the power to appropriate money, and not executive officers. If the Department can exceed its authority in the sum of \$50,000, then it can do so a million of dollars. People whom I have the honor to represent want these routes, but they do not want them without authority of law.

Mr. LENTZ. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend. on page 39, by striking out, in lines 5 and 6, the word "one" and inserting the word "two;" so as to make it read "\$300,000."

Mr. LENTZ. The gentleman from Missouri proposes to strike out the \$50,000, and I desire to strike out the "fifty," and change the "one" to "two."

Mr. CANNON. May I suggest to the gentleman from Ohio that we vote on the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri first?

Mr. LENTZ. I am willing to vote down this amendment of the gentleman from Missouri. I think we have not got enough money in there, and I want to say so. I am willing to withhold my amendment until this amendment is voted on. I think this reduction ought to be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LENTZ. Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to renew the offer of my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 6 strike out the word "one" and the words "and fifty" and insert in place of the word "one" the word "two;" so as to read "\$300,000."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas offers the following amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "dollars," in line 6, page 39, add the following language: "Such service shall be justly and equally apportioned among the several States and Territories."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I think that is subject to a point of order, and while I would not make it, I want to finish the bill to-night and I am compelled to make it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I desire to strike out the last word. The Fiftieth Congress began the work of preparing appropriations for experimental village free delivery. Upon that subject my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] outlined the history of legislation this morning.

The Fifty-third Congress made an appropriation of \$10,000 for rural free delivery. Now, village free delivery never amounted to anything and never will, for the simple reason that the people who live in the villages are within ten minutes' walk of their mail all the time. The Fifty-third Congress went further. I had something to do with that, because it happened that I had seen, in many countries of the world much less densely populated than Mississippi is, the mail being delivered along to the boxes upon the mail routes. The Fifty-third Congress voted \$10,000, but left its expenditure discretionary with the Postmaster-General. Postmaster-General Bissell expressed the opinion that there was more politics than postal service in that particular appropriation and absolutely declined to exercise the discretion with which Congress had vested him. After that a cohort of gentlemen here interested in the question, with whom I am proud to number myself as one, made an appropriation and made it mandatory.

Notwithstanding the mandatory provision, the Postmaster-General still refused to exercise the power vested in him at that time. Later on, under Mr. Wilson, who became Postmaster-General, this service began to grow a little bit. He began to be told about what was possible and about what had been accomplished elsewhere. I myself wrote to him a letter, which is upon file there now, telling him what I knew about free delivery elsewhere, and about the evolution of free delivery without governmental aid in a part of my own district.

Later on the postmaster took hold of it, and I want to congratulate the House to-day—and that is the purpose for which I rose—upon the fact that with this small beginning we have arrived now at the present proportions of this appropriation and at the present proportions of this public service; and to express the hope that my friends upon both sides of this Chamber who are interested in the ultimate welfare of this service, a service which in my opinion is of the utmost importance to the farming communities, not only on account of their commerce, not only on account of their social letters, but as a great educational provision, superior in my opinion to the facilities that could be furnished by any university in the United States, merely as an educational matter—I wish to express the hope that they will let this clause of this bill, just as it is, go through the House, and that later on, when we come to make an appropriation for the next fiscal year, we may remember the lessons of progress which we have learned, and that we may especially remember the magnificent lessons which are included in this rural free-delivery report of the First Assistant Postmaster-General, fully illustrated, fully explained in every respect; that we may not encumber this bill with our efforts to further the service, but that we may remember what has been accomplished, what has been successfully experimented with and brought to a point where it is no longer a matter of expense; and then, when we come to the appropriation bill for the next fiscal year, that we may remember that the rural communities of this country, the farmers of this country, who pay a great part of the taxes, who are over half of the population of this country, who are expected to furnish the main material in time of war, are entitled to something under our Administration. And I hope that when the time comes we may appropriate \$1,000,000 to this purpose, while we are appropriating millions to little buildings in large cities. [Applause.] We appropriated \$3,000,000 here not long ago for one building in one city, and yet I find men who do not want to appropriate \$1,000,000 to allow the farmers of this country to have rural free delivery.

Mr. MERCER. I hope, Mr. Chairman, it will increase the vote in Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Well, Mr. Chairman, if education would increase the Republican vote, this would increase it; but my historical recollection is that any educational qualification always decreases the Republican vote in Mississippi. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MERCER. Something is the matter with it, I know.

Mr. CANNON. Now I hope the Clerk may be permitted to read.

The Clerk resumed and completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. I ask unanimous consent to return to page 12, and to offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to return to page 12, and to offer an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The amendment was read, as follows:

On page 12, after line 4, insert:

"For payment of the expenses connected with the investigation of the claims of the members of the Fourth Arkansas Mounted Infantry, including pay of clerk, stenographer, cost of printing, advertising, and stationery, traveling and hotel expenses, expenses of witnesses, and all other incidental expenses actually and necessarily incurred under the provisions of the act of Congress approved February 27, 1899, for the relief of the Fourth Arkansas Mounted Infantry, \$2,000."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

And then, on motion of Mr. CANNON, the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DALZELL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6237) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, and for prior years, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back with sundry amendments, and with the recommendation that as amended the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendments? If not, they will be voted upon in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. CANNON, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I ask unanimous consent to report back from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk and to ask a re-reference of the same.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] asks unanimous consent to change the reference of a bill the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4470) granting pensions to certain officers and enlisted men of the Life-Saving Service and to their widows and minor children.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the reference of this bill will be changed to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MEETING AT 1 O'CLOCK TO-MORROW.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, gentlemen on each side of the Chamber have suggested that they desire to attend the exercises to-morrow connected with the unveiling of the Webster statue. This will necessarily take till 12 o'clock or later, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet at 1 o'clock to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourn to-day it be to meet at 1 o'clock to-morrow. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS.

Mr. BULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Accounts is hereby granted leave to sit during the sessions of the House during the present Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PAYNE. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until 1 o'clock p. m. to-morrow.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the draft of a bill to prevent the failure of military justice, and for other pur-

poses—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings filed by the court in the case of the brig *Lady Waltherstorff*, John Guttersen, master, against the United States—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Supervising Architect, submitting an estimate of appropriation for repairs of the post-office and sub-treasury building at Boston, Mass.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Supervising Surgeon-General of the Marine-Hospital Service, submitting an estimate of appropriation for a laundry at the hospital at Detroit, Mich.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of State, submitting an estimate of appropriation for increase of salary of United States consul at Port Stanley, Falkland Islands—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, relating to the printing of the report on the agricultural capabilities of Alaska—to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. BARNEY, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6627) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes, reported the same, accompanied by a report (No. 68); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KLEBERG, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2956) to extend the time for the completion of the incline railway on West Mountain, Hot Springs Reservation, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 69); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MINOR, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1040) to amend section 4445 of Title LII of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to the licensing of officers of steam vessels, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 71); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WARNER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5493) for the relief of claimants having suits against the United States pending in the circuit and district courts of the United States affected by the act of June 27, 1898, amending the act of March 3, 1887, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 72); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, Mr. ROBB, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4686) for the relief of J. A. Ware, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 67); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6382) granting a pension to Harriet V. D. Cook—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 6381) granting an increase of pension to Israel Walter—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 6379) granting a pension to Janet L. P. Taylor—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 6292) for the relief of George W. Payne—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS
INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BARNEY: A bill (H. R. 6627) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes—to the Union Calendar.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 6628) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Brighton, in the State of New Jersey—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. WEEKS: A bill (H. R. 6629) to provide for and create a judicial district in the State of Michigan, to be designated as the northeastern district of Michigan, and for the appointment of a district judge and other officers therein, and for the holding of courts therein—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 6630) for a post-office building at Adrian, Mich.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6631) for a post-office building at Ann Arbor, Mich.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CATCHINGS: A bill (H. R. 6632) to create a commission to adjudicate the claims of citizens of the United States growing out of the destruction of property and for other depredations committed on the island of Cuba during the late insurrection on said island—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 6633) to fix the salaries of the Chief Justice and judges of the Court of Claims—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 6634) to enlarge the powers of the Department of Agriculture, prohibit the transportation by interstate commerce of game killed in violation of local laws, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LITTLE: A bill (H. R. 6635) to prohibit railroad companies from charging more than 3 cents per mile for carrying passengers through the Indian Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 6636) to extend the time for presenting claims for additional bounties—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CHICKERING: A bill (H. R. 6637) providing for the sale of a certain water lot in the village of Sacketts Harbor, N. Y.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. TONGUE: A bill (H. R. 6638) to amend section 1 of chapter 1914 of page 450, volume 25, of the United States Statutes at Large, and approved August 27, 1888, and entitled "An act to provide aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of United States"—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRIGGS: A bill (H. R. 6639) to continue experiments with free rural mail delivery—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6640) for a public building at the city of Albany, Ga., and appropriating money therefor—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RAY of New York: A bill (H. R. 6641) defining and limiting the cases in which an absolute divorce may be granted, and providing for declaring marriages void in certain cases in the District of Columbia and the Territories—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROUSSARD (by request): A bill (H. R. 6642) for the establishment of a light-house at Sabine Pass, Louisiana and Texas—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARMER: A bill (H. R. 6643) to place officers of the Army upon the same footing as regards retirement with officers of the Navy, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 6644) to amend an act entitled "An act to extend Rhode Island avenue," approved February 10, 1899—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STOKES: A bill (H. R. 6645) to extend the free mail-delivery service, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 6646) for the relief of the Kickapoo tribe of Indians in Oklahoma Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BAKER: A bill (H. R. 6647) providing for the extension of the London Park National Cemetery, near Baltimore, Md.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DINSMORE: A bill (H. R. 6756) for the erection of a public building at Harrison, Ark.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 6757) to repeal subdivision 12 of section 2338 of the Revised Statutes of the United States—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BURKETT: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 122) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer a certain piece of land in the State of Nebraska to the city of Lincoln—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GRIGGS: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 123) to amend the Constitution of the United States so as to provide for taxing incomes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 124) providing for a preliminary survey of channels in Boston Harbor—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ACHESON: A resolution of the legislature of Pennsylvania, in relation to the election of United States Senators by popular vote—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. MERCER: A resolution by the legislature of Pennsylvania, providing for the appointment of a committee to confer with the legislatures of other States of the Union regarding an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which shall provide for the election of United States Senators by popular vote—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 6648) granting a pension to Sarah J. Taylor—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 6649) granting an increase of pension to Orpha W. Reynolds—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BENTON: A bill (H. R. 6650) to place Daniel M. Page, late first lieutenant, Thirty-eighth United States Infantry, on the retired list of the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY: A bill (H. R. 6651) for the relief of Oliver P. Perry, administrator of the estate of Mary Scott, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BARBER: A bill (H. R. 6652) to correct the military record of John Sailer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6653) to increase the pension of Levi Moser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAKER: A bill (H. R. 6654) for the relief of Thomas J. Benson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6655) granting a pension to Sarah A. North—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6656) for the relief of the legal representatives of Henry W. Archer, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6657) for relief of David E. Haller, Company D, Third Regiment Guard Mount Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6658) for the relief of the heirs of Edmund Wolf—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6659) to remove the charge of desertion from Patrick H. McCall, late an enlisted man in the United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6660) for the relief of Robert E. Morgan—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6661) for the relief of the legal representatives of Robert R. Vandiver, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6662) for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of James Herron—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6663) for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of William G. Burke, deceased, late of Harford County, Md.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6664) for the relief of James S. Crawford—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CATCHINGS: A bill (H. R. 6665) for the relief of the estate of Harry H. Beard, deceased, late of Coahoma County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6666) for the relief of the estate of Joel Hul-lum, deceased, late of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6667) for the relief of the estate of F. C. Henderson, deceased, late of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6668) for the relief of the estate of Samuel Worthington, deceased, late of Washington County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6669) for the relief of the estate of S. A. Snodgrass, deceased, late of Bolivar County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6670) for the relief of Frank Harris, of Bovina, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6671) for the relief of Adeline L. Hebron, of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6672) for the relief of Grace Ann Mitchell, of Jonestown, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6673) for the relief of Mary Ann Nagle, of Vicksburg, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6674) for the relief of Sallie A. Woolfolk, of Bolivar County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6675) for the relief of Margaret Young, of Warren County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COCHRANE of New York: A bill (H. R. 6676) for the relief of Edward G. Garner, Company E, One hundred and twenty-eighth New York Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 6677) for the relief of Calvin Nelson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DAVEY: A bill (H. R. 6678) granting an increase of pension to Agnes Capron—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 6679) for the relief of John Nay, of Shinnston, Harrison County, W. Va.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DICK: A bill (H. R. 6680) granting a pension to Ellen D. Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DINSMORE: A bill (H. R. 6681) for the relief of George W. Pierce, of Berryville, Carroll County, Ark.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6682) for the relief of Mary A. Hancock, widow of Samuel Tow, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 6683) for the relief of Edward A. Scott, of Crawford County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6684) for the payment of the claim of Mary J. McCall, of Eureka Springs, Ark., administratrix of the estate of James Bridgman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6685) for the relief of Mary Hutchens—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6686) for a pension for Catherine Robards Stirman, of Fayetteville, Ark.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6687) for the relief John Miser—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6688) for the relief of the estate of Albert L. Berry, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6689) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Standwix H. Mayfield—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6690) for the relief of the heirs at law of J. Woolum—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6691) for the relief of estate of Jesse Hollingshead, deceased, late of Benton County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6692) to grant a pension to Lavina Smith, widow of Pry Amos Smith—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6693) for the relief of the estate of Nathan P. English—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6694) for the relief of A. M. Webb, of Green Forest, Carroll County, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6695) for the relief of Daniel McKeever, of Fayetteville, Ark.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FREER: A bill (H. R. 6696) for the relief of Ammon McLaughlin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6697) for the relief of Josiah Chinn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLETCHER: A bill (H. R. 6698) granting a pension to Syrena Whitcomb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of New York: A bill (H. R. 6699) for the relief of Frank G. Osborn—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GRAFF: A bill (H. R. 6700) to increase the pension of Maria Andrews—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6701) granting a pension to Serelda C. McGrew—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts (by request): A bill (H. R. 6702) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca P. Quint—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 6703) for the relief of Corinne Strickland—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6704) granting a pension to Corinne Strickland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIGGS: A bill (H. R. 6705) for the relief of Mrs. Susan A. Diedrich—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6706) granting a pension to Mrs. Sarah Grove Hall—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 6707) for the relief of Carolina Carter, of Charlottesville, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HARMER: A bill (H. R. 6708) to correct the military record of John McKinley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6709) to correct the military record of Calvin Hough—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6710) to correct the military record of William H. Greenfield—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSTON: A bill (H. R. 6711) to pay trustees of Baptist Church at Beckley, W. Va., for their property destroyed by United States Army—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6712) to pay trustees of Baptist Church at Sutton, W. Va., for their property destroyed by United States Army—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 6713) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. Annie Duncan Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6714) granting a pension to Matilda Zimmerman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6715) granting a pension to Mary E. Sergeant—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNOX: A bill (H. R. 6716) for the relief of Charles M. Peirce—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 6717) for the benefit of the legal representatives of Asbury Dickens—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A bill (H. R. 6718) granting an increase of pension to John B. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LENTZ: A bill (H. R. 6719) to increase pension of Elias Barker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6720) to correct the military record of Charles Dagenfield—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6721) to increase pension of Edward A. Cavin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6722) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin E. Styles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6723) to amend the military record of William G. Alspach—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6724) to correct the military record of Mathias Keith—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6725) to pension Mary E. Beaton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6726) to correct the military record of Peter Kramer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIDGELY: A bill (H. R. 6727) for the relief of David Hogan—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LANE: A bill (H. R. 6728) granting an increase of pension to Esek B. Chandler—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McDOWELL: A bill (H. R. 6729) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Peter R. Eddy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PRINCE: A bill (H. R. 6730) for relief of the heirs at law of Thomas Eames, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6731) granting a pension to William F. Tait—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6732) granting a pension to Asa W. Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 6733) to extend Letters Patent No. 290958, for a new and useful improvement in suspenders, in favor of the Atwood Suspender Company, of Swanton, Vt.—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. RAY of New York: A bill (H. R. 6734) granting an increase of pension to Julius S. Haradon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 6735) for the relief of the legal personal representatives of Henry H. Sibley, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBB: A bill (H. R. 6736) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Thomas J. Cavender—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHATTUC: A bill (H. R. 6737) to remove the charge of desertion against Frank Wempe and grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 6738) to increase the pension of Daniel F. Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6739) to pension Samuel W. Gilliland, of Miller County, Mo.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6740) to pension J. C. Vanpool, of Miller County, Mo.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6741) to pension Alexander A. Simpson, of Miller County, Mo.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6742) to correct the military record of Henry Shull, and so forth—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6743) to amend and correct the record of Company C, Ninth Regiment Missouri State Militia, by including the name of Alfred H. Tipton therein, with the dates of his enlistment and discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6744) for the relief of Samuel P. Dresser, of Miller County, Mo.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 6745) to grant a pension to A. J. Caffey, a veteran of the Mexican war—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCUDDER: A bill (H. R. 6746) for the relief of Christen Woldike—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6747) to remove the charge of desertion against John Skillicam, late of the First Excelsior Regiment, subsequently the Seventieth Regiment New York Volunteers, and authorize his honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6748) for the relief of the next kin of Chester Hatfield, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 6749) for the relief of Mary A. Swift—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STOKES: A bill (H. R. 6750) for the relief of J. H. Williams—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 6751) for the relief of Sarah F. Trenwith, executrix of Clifford W. Simpson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THROPP: A bill (H. R. 6752) to correct military record of Abraham Gibson and to remove the charge of desertion therefrom—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 6753) to amend the military record of Hiram Sheldon, late of Company G, One hundred and sixteenth Ohio Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6754) to amend the military record of William Warner, late private, Company H, Fourth Pennsylvania Reserve Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ZENOR: A bill (H. R. 6755) granting a pension to Sarah L. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CATCHINGS: A bill (H. R. 6758) for the relief of Mrs. Eugenia M. Allen, née Rossman—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 6759) for the relief of Andrew A. Colter—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6760) granting a pension to Nancy Cate—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 6761) granting an increase of pension to Michael Morris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MADDOX: A bill (H. R. 6762) for the relief of Charles R. Johnson, trustee of Elizabeth Johnson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MOON (by request): A bill (H. R. 6763) for the relief of Narcissa T. Byrd, of Chatata, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6764) for relief of Shiloh Presbyterian Church, Calhoun, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6765) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, Calhoun, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of Rev. M. L. Tibbetts and other citizens of Butler County, Iowa, against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, resolutions of five railway organizations represented at union meeting at Carnegie, Pa., in favor of certain legislation in the interest of railroad employees—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BARTLETT: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Atlanta, Ga., relative to the improvement of the St. Johns River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of Campbell T. King and 30 other druggists of Macon, Ga., urging the repeal of the internal-revenue tax on proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine: Petitions of F. W. Keniston and others, of Guilford, Me., and L. B. Berritt and others, of Houlton, Me., against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: Petition of 65 clerks employed in the New York post-office, in favor of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DALZELL: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburg, Pa., favoring the passage of a bill granting a competing submarine cable line between the United States and Cuba—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the druggists of Washington, Pa., asking for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Marine Society of New York City, for the passage of the shipping bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the New York Chamber of Commerce, in favor of the increase of coast artillery—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOVENER: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to John Nay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDDY: Resolution of the Trades' League of Philadelphia, Pa., for cable facilities between the United States and Cuba—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the St. Paul Chamber of Commerce, in favor

of placing hides on the free list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Northwestern Manufacturers' Association, favoring the passage of House bill No. 887, in the interest of manufacturing and commercial industries—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of retail druggists of Alexandria, Minn., for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Minneapolis Trades and Labor Council, against modifying the letter carriers' eight-hours-a-day bill—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts: Petition of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, asking that Highland light be changed from a fixed white light to an intermittent light—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, favoring the passage of the shipping bill—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the brewing industry of the United States, asking for a reduction of the tax upon fermented liquors—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, protest of the Pork Packers and Provision Dealers' Association of Cincinnati, Ohio, against the discrimination in the classification of freights upon shippers of less than carload lots—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Resolutions of the Winona County Medical Society, urging the passage of Senate bill No. 34, relating to the prevention of cruelty to animals in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, resolution of the Minneapolis Trade and Labor Council, protesting against the passage of a certain bill to modify the letter carriers' eight-hours-a-day law—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of post-office clerks at Wheaton, Ill., in favor of the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of James H. Brisbin, of Allegheny, Pa., and other railway postal clerks in the Twenty-third Congressional district of Pennsylvania, for the reclassification of the Railway Mail Service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolution of the Central Labor Union of Washington, D. C., in opposition to section 3 of House bill No. 5486—to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts (by request): Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Rebecca P. Quint—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, requesting the passage of the shipping bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARMER: Papers to accompany House bill granting an increase of pension to Mary W. Kilborn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolution of the Philadelphia Local Preachers' Association of the Methodist Episcopal Church, against the seating of B. H. Roberts, of Utah—to the Special Committee on the B. H. Roberts Case.

Also, petition of W. R. Warner & Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., asking for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of George W. Jaques, of South Amboy, N. J., relating to the stamp tax on medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LENTZ: Paper to accompany House bill to correct the military record of Peter Kramer—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS: Resolution of the Georgia Bankers' Association, favoring the establishment of a subtreasury by the Government in the central or southeastern Atlantic States, preferably at Savannah, Ga.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the post-office clerks of Americus, Ga., post-office, urging the passage of House bill No. 4351, for the classification of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of Macon, Ga., for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the letter carriers of Atlanta, Ga., favoring the passage of House bill No. 4911, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LONG: Petition of Levi Ferguson and 99 citizens of Wellington, Kans., urging the continued support of the Government in preserving the lines of battle, etc., at Gettysburg—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, resolutions of Union Veterans' Union, of Garden City, Kans., and of the Second Regiment, Union Veterans' Union, of Wichita, Kans., protesting against the passage of House bill No. 3899—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McALEER: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of New York for equipment of coast artillery for defense—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Petitions of druggists of the city of New York, asking for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MADDOX: Petition of Charles R. Johnson, trustee of Elizabeth Johnson, deceased, praying reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MOON: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Shiloh Presbyterian Church, Calhoun, Tenn., and for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church of South Calhoun, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Papers to accompany House bill No. 5443, for the relief of Elizabeth Edwards—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRINCE: Petitions of clerks of the post-offices at Moline and Sterling, Ill., favoring the passage of House bill No. 4351, for the classification of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RAY of New York: Petition of citizens of Earlville, N. Y., for the passage of a bill relating to dairy food and products—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBB: Papers to accompany House bill to remove the charge of desertion against the military record of J. Cavender—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 5712, for the relief of Charles Maschmeyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHATTUC: Papers to accompany House bill to remove the charge of desertion against the military record of Frank Wempe—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Papers to accompany bill granting a pension to A. J. Coffey—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: Petition of Sarah F. Trenwith, executrix of Clifford W. Simpson, deceased, for reference of war claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THROPP: Statement to accompany House bill to correct the military record of Abraham Gibson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, favoring the passage of the shipping bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Andrew Morton and Hugo Seaberg, of Springer, N. Mex., objecting to the admission of New Mexico as a State—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of Sarah Clay Bennett and Martha E. Root, of the Woman's Suffrage Association, favoring a sixteenth amendment to the Constitution granting suffrage to women—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, urging the increase of the coast artillery—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the Central Labor Union of Washington, D. C., relating to section 3 of House bill No. 5486—to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. ZIEGLER: Four petitions of druggists of Cumberland County, Pa., and one petition of 18 druggists of the city of York, Pa., relating to the stamp tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, January 18, 1900.

The Senate met at 1 o'clock p. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on motion of Mr. NELSON, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal, without objection, will stand approved.

INDEX OF REPORTS OF SECRETARIES OF SENATE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, in response to a resolution of March 3, 1899, a complete alphabetical index of the annual reports of the Secretaries of the Senate; which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

SUBSISTENCE FUNDS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from Acting Commissary-General of Subsistence urging the importance of securing legislation to authorize all officers who disburse subsistence funds to keep in their personal possession, for disbursement, such unrestricted amounts as may be authorized from time to time by the Secretary of War; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6237) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, and for prior years, and for other purposes; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore presented a memorial of the Luzerne County Medical Society, of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for the further prevention of cruelty to animals in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to define and fix the standard of value and to maintain the parity of all forms of money issued or coined by the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. NELSON presented a memorial of the State Agricultural Society of Minnesota, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to promote commerce and increase the foreign trade of the United States, and to provide auxiliary cruisers, transports, and seamen for Government use when necessary; which was referred to Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Dr. Koch Vegetable Tea Company, of Winona, Minn., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McMILLAN presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Menominee, Mich., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the memorial of Dr. H. J. Stauffer and sundry other citizens of Jeannette, Pa., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for the further prevention of cruelty to animals in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. McBRIDE presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Salem, Oreg., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. CLAY presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Atlanta, Ga., praying that an appropriation be made providing for the deepening of the channel of the St. Johns River from Jacksonville to the ocean; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Augusta, Ga., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the reorganization of the United States Weather Bureau; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. ALLEN presented a memorial of the First Regiment, Vicksburg Command, Division of Nebraska, Union Veterans Union, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing the age limit for entering the Weather Service of the Government; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Cal., and the Board of Trade of Pasadena, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the inspection and treatment of trees, plants, buds, cuttings, grafts, scions, nursery stock, and fruit imported into the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Merchants' Exchange of Oakland, Cal., praying for the construction of the Nicaragua Canal; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Los Angeles, Cal., and of the Merchants' Exchange Association of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the insertion of an item in the deficiency appropriation bill to prevent the discontinuance of the hydrographic branch of the United States Geological Survey; which was referred to the Committee on the Geological Survey.

He also presented a memorial of the Board of Trade of Pasadena, Cal., remonstrating against the reduction of the present tariff on citrus fruit importations, and remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed reciprocity treaty with the British West Indies; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Pasadena, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the construction of a canal through the Central American Isthmus; which was ordered to lie on the table.